The Nation

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1916.

Summary of the News

The German reply to the American note of April 20 was handed to Ambassador Gerard on May 4, and the text, as received by wireless, was published in the evening papers of the following day. A curious blend of insolence and ungracious yielding, the note was, in large part, clearly intended for home consumption, and has been generally so accepted in this country. The part of the note really material to the issue was contained in a single paragraph, wherein the German Government stated that the following instructions had been issued to submarine commanders: "In accordance with the general principles of visit and search, and the destruction of merchant vessels, recognized by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared a naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives unless the ship attempt to escape or offer resistance." To this concession a tag was attached, implying that the continuance of the order might be dependent on the action taken by the United States in regard to Great Britain's alleged violations of international law in the conduct of her blockade.

The reply of the United States, which went forward on Monday, and was published in Tuesday's papers, was curt. Accepting the material part of the German note as evidence of the Imperial Government's determination "to impose upon all its commanders at sea the limitations of the recognized rules of international law upon which the Government of the United States has insisted," it warned Germany that the United States would "rely upon a scrupulous execution henceforth of the now altered policy." The reply concluded with an explicit notification that the United States "cannot for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and non-combatants."

Simultaneously with the publication of this ultimate note, Mr. Lansing issued a brief statement, explaining, first, that so long as Germany lives up to her altered policy, there will be no reason to quarrel with her; secondly, that "the losses resulting from the violation of American rights by German submarine commanders operating under the former policy will have to be settled"; and, thirdly, that in its dealings with the British Government the United States is acting as it is bound to act in accordance with the arbitration treaty negotiated by Mr. Bryan.

Two other points in the German communication may be noted. First, some significance has been attached to the statement that the German Government "twice within the last few months announced before the world its readiness to make peace on a basis safeguarding Germany's vital interests." This statement, taken in connection with a report that a message received by President Wilson from the Pope on Sunday had to do with possible coöperation to bring about peace, has led to a recrudescence of peace rumors. Secondly, the official reassertion by Germany that the submarine warfare was undertaken in reprisal for the British attempt to "starve" non-combatant Germans elicited a reply through the Associated Press on May 6 from Lord Robert Cecil, Minister of War Trade. The chronology is as follows: On February 4, 1915, notification was given of the German submarine campaign; on February 18 it went into effect; on March 1 Mr. Asquith outlined in the House of Commons the measures to be taken in reply to the German policy; on March 11 the Orders in Council came into force.

Acuteness was added to the situation in Mexico by the announcement on Sunday that on the preceding Friday a band of Mexicans had raided the American settlements of Glen Springs and Boquillas, looting and burning the places, and killing American soldiers and civilians. Gen. Funston has organized forces for the pursuit of the raiders, and Secretary Baker on Tuesday announced that President Wilson had called out the militia of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Two additional regiments of regular infantry have also been ordered to the border. News of this latest outrage came at a time when the conferences between Gen. Scott and Gen. Obregon appeared to have resulted in a satisfactory agreement, announcement to that effect having been made at the White House on May 4.

Robert Fay and two associates were convicted on Monday in the New York Federal District Court on two indictments charging them with conspiring to sink freighters carrying munitions to the Allies.

Senate amendments to the Army bill were again rejected by the House on Monday, and the measure returned to conference. The proposal to empower the President to raise the standing army to 250,000 men in time of peace was defeated by a vote of 221 to 142; that to raise a Federal volunteer army of 261,000 by 251 to 109.

Renewed troubles in Santo Domingo have caused the landing there of American marines. President Jimenez was impeached by the Chamber of Deputies on May 2, and retaliated by declaring the capital in a state of siege and removing the seat of Government to San Geronimo, a suburb. Dispatches on Monday stated that President Jimenez had resigned to prevent armed intervention by the United States, but on Tuesday a brief cable announced the landing of American marines.

Dispatches from London of May 5 announced that the British Government had decided to free at once the Germans and Austrians who were taken from the steamship China by a British cruiser, and in regard to whom Secretary Lansing had addressed strong representations to Great Britain. Lord Robert Cecil announced at the same time that changes had been made in the method of examining mails, in an effort to meet the complaints of neutral shippers, and foreshadowed a possible modification of several early Orders in Council to make them correspond with recent decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The suppression of the revolt in Ireland has been followed by the prompt trial and execution or imprisonment of its leaders. In all, eleven of the leaders have been executed during the past week, and thirty-seven who were condemned to death have had their sentences commuted. It was announced on Tuesday that the courts-martial had completed their work. The resignation of Mr. Birrell, Chief Secretary for Ireland, was announced on May 4.

Dr. Karl Liebknecht, the Socialist leader, was arrested in connection with disorders which occurred in Berlin on May 1.

Three Zeppelins have been accounted for during the past week. One, the L-20, which had participated in a raid on the British coast on the night of May 2, resulting in thirty-six casualties, was wrecked off the coast of Norway on its return. Two others were destroyed, respectively, by British warships off the German coast and by French warships at Salonica.

The Crown Prince's troops continue hammering at Verdun. Following the French offensive last week came a German drive to the west and east of the Meuse, which is described as more powerful than any since the beginning of the eighty-day battle. The objectives were Dead Man Hill and Hill 304. Certain French positions were occupied on Hill 304, but counter attacks by the French apparently regained some of the lost ground.

Since we wrote last week twelve ships have been reported sunk or damaged, presumably by torpedoes. Two of these were steamers under charter by the American Commission for Relief in Belgium. Another was a Brazilian steamship, the Rio Branco, the sinking of which has caused an outburst of indignation in Brazil, and correspondingly firm support of the position taken by the United States. Another Spanish vessel, the Vinifreda, was sunk on April 30, whether by torpedo or by mine has not been determined. The other ships lost were three French and five British. Among the last was the White Star liner Cymric, carrying munitions of war, but no passengers, which was torpedoed off the Irish coast on Monday, and sank the following day.

The Military Service bill, for general compulsion, was introduced in the House of Commons on May 3, and passed its second reading on the following day. A motion to reject the bill was defeated by 328 to 36 votes.

Dispatches from London on Monday stated that the Government had decided to organize immediately an expedition for the relief of Sir Ernest Shackleton.

Dispatches from Athens on Tuesday announced the election by a large majority of M. Venizelos as member of the Chamber of Deputies for Mytilene.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

The raid upon Glenn Springs gives no new aspect to the Mexican problem. It emphasizes the magnitude of the task with which we are confronted in guarding the border, a task which we have had to face since the beginning of Mexican unrest, long before Mr. Wilson became President. It is beside the mark to argue that this latest outrage disposes of the possibility of our withdrawal from Mexico. No such step has been contemplated at Washington, and the purpose of the Scott-Obregon negotiations has been to perfect measures for the re-establishment of permanent security on the frontier. If there are not enough American forces in hand to guard the long line from Douglas to Brownsville, it is for the Administration to decide how this defect shall be remedied. Something should certainly be done to make further raids impossible, but when the war-shouters rise to announce that this "something" must be intervention, it is not the safety of the border they have in mind, but that open conflict with the Mexican people of which they have not yet given up hope. For the extirpation of banditry in northern Mexico we have resorted to measures which involved the risk of war, but only if it were forced upon us. What we are asked to suppose is that a break with Carranza, the destruction of the only existing authority in Mexico, and a full-fledged war against the Mexican people would redound to the safety of Americans north of the Rio Grande.

President Wilson's talk to the delegates of the American Union Against Militarism leaves him still the politician speaking not to the committee before him, but to the electorate at large. He says that arming largely is not a matter of principle, but one of pure expediency. The American people are not in danger of being militarized, but it is possible that they might be. He draws an adroit distinction between universal military training and universal military service. The militarists are quite careless about this distinction, for they believe that if they get one, the other will follow. Next, the President takes the mistaken ground that we cannot lead in the direction of international disarmament unless we have considerable forces to disarm, and he waves aside the suggestion that the United States has achieved notable diplomatic victories in the past by the facile remark that the "world has changed since 1895." This is the same excuse which he has advanced for his change of front on the Tariff Commission and other issues; but principles do not change, and there is a vital principle behind all of this military business—the rigid control of the military by the civilian authority. If this is not a principle, then there are no principles whatever laid down in the "New Freedom," and everything there from the partnership of the Government with business on the question of the tariff to the control of big business is merely a matter of expediency.

We know now when the decay of the American navy set in under the maleficent influence of Secretary Daniels and the Democratic Administration as a whole. The report of the General Board of the Navy, dealing with our fall from second rank among the fleets of the world, gives exact dates. On the basis of displacement of ships built and building, the United States dropped behind Germany in 1909. On the basis of displacement of ships in commission we fell behind in 1911. For part of 1909 Mr. Roosevelt was President. In 1911 Mr. Taft was President. Since it is inconceivable that Mr. Roosevelt should have been responsible for the criminal neglect of our navy, it must be assumed that the loss of second place in 1909 occurred after March 4 of that year. But, on the other hand, a fleet does not go to pieces in a day. There are such things as naval programmes which must be drafted years in advance. If, therefore, in 1909 our navy had to make way for Germany's, it must be that for several years before that there was not that wise prevision of our national needs and duties for which responsibility rests on—Secretary Daniels. As for the way in which our navy can regain second place, the General Board finds it all very simple. If Congress should pass a law "requiring shipbuilding firms to disregard all other contracts and requiring all manufacturers to do the same," and if "the limitations of the eight-hour labor laws were removed," and if Congress would consent to an increase of 40 per cent. in the cost of ship construction involved in reducing the time of building, the thing could be done. In other words, all we need is the mobilization of our industries and our labor supply under some such compulsion bill as Mr. Asquith has introduced in Parliament. Presumably it was the lack of such powers that prevented Roosevelt's Administration from maintaining the navy's status among the fleets of the world.

In the letter about Mr. Brandeis which President Wilson sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday, there is much that is eloquent and much that is true. The description of Mr. Brandeis as a man of rare intellectual powers, who has ably and disinterestedly performed many acts of public service, is in accord with facts known of all. But nothing of this goes to the real objections made to the nomination of Mr. Brandeis as a Judge of the Supreme Court. The President hurts his own case when he asserts that the charges against Mr. Brandeis "proceeded for the most part from those who hated Mr. Brandeis because he had refused to be serviceable to them in the promotion of their own selfish interests, and from those whom they had prejudiced and misled." This is far too cavalier treatment of the eminent Boston lawyers, and the six most recent presidents of the American Bar Association, who have testified with regret that they believed Mr. Brandeis, on the basis of his "character and professional career," unfit to be a Judge of the Supreme Court. And for Mr. Wilson to state that he himself "looked into" the charges against Brandeis three years ago and found them baseless, is absurd as bearing on the case now laid before the Judiciary Committee. What was gossip and report in 1913 has now been buttressed by sworn evidence and documents. No such mass of testimony could have been looked into by the President, or anybody else, before it was assembled at the hearings of the Senate Committee. By it and by the brief prepared by Mr. Austen Fox, many a warm friend of Mr. Brandeis has been staggered. No wonder that the Senate hesitates to confirm him. Whether it finally does so or not, the long and bitter controversy over the appointment is proof enough that it never should have been made. It is unseemly that a judge should enter the Supreme Court by the door of passion and political wrangling.

It is good news that House and Senate have come to an agreement on an Indian Appropriation bill that settles several vexed questions. One of these concerns irrigation projects on Indian lands, some having contended that the work should be paid for out of Indian funds, others that the Indians should not be required to finance improvements the benefits of which are shared by whites outside the reservations. The con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferrees have agreed that the Government shall pay for the projects, and be reimbursed by property-owning Indians and whites in proportion to the benefits received. The same solicitude appears in the settlement of the question of the distribution of Choctaw Indian funds. The so-called Mississippi Choctaws have always clamored for their share of this money, but have been opposed on the ground that many are not Indians, but negroes, and that much of the money they received would go to lawyers. It appears that comprehensive payment will be provided for, with a provision that in the case of Indians not of full blood the Secretary of the Interior may withhold payment and use the funds for the general benefit of the people. A Senate provision carrying $250,000 for schools among the Sioux, where Catholic schools already exist, has now been dropped till investigation of the need for new facilities can be undertaken. More than a million and a half is proposed for education, $150,000 for suppression of the liquor traffic, and—it is especially pleasing to learn—"large amounts for hospitals, sanitation, and similar work."

The greatest step against the illegal activities of German agents on our soil since the dismissal of Dumba, von Papen, and Boy-Ed is taken in the conviction of the three men charged with conspiring to destroy munitions ships sailing from New York—Fay, Scholz, and Daeche. Fay's offence contained much more serious implications than the attempted crimes for which Paul Koenig and Werner Horn were indicted. Fay was not only an officer of the German army, but he confessed last October that he had been taken from active service especially for work in America, that he had been sent to the United States under orders from the German Secret Service, and that he had reported his mission to von Papen and Boy-Ed. With his conviction, the Government may feel a fair amount of confidence that the criminal activities which these two attachés were so helpful in setting in motion in this country have been decisively stopped. The trials of von Igel, the German accused of much the same designs against the Welland Canal that Paul Koenig entertained, and of Scheele, who was one with Fay and his confederates in his hope of destroying munitions ships with fire bombs, will proceed promptly. The process of justice has taken a firm and rapid course in all these cases, and the succession of convictions in the last three months ought to impress German sympathizers in this country with the unwisdom of meddling with our neutrality.

From the beginning, Mr. Asquith's attitude towards conscription has been one of provisional opposition. Like the great majority of Englishmen, he has shrunk from the abandonment of the historic tradition unless absolute necessity compelled such a step. This condition, Mr. Asquith believes, has now arrived, and for proof he cites the conversion of the great mass of opinion in the House of Commons. Just why the necessity should exist is not so clear, and the Premier's own figures of the present armed strength of the British Empire adds to the confusion. If the army and navy are today five million strong, it is hard to see how the addition of the much disputed 200,000 unattested married men would make a vital difference. It would mean an increase of only 4 per cent. Only on the supposition that the war is to continue literally to the last man and the last pound can the Premier's conversion to compulsory service be explained on military grounds. Yet the impelling reasons are very probably not military in the strict sense, but political and industrial. A discontented mass of 200,000 men can become a serious handicap to that complete national effort and efficiency which the winning of the war demands. And if the 200,000 married men have their grievance, there are the men already under arms who are very likely inclined to look upon the married men as shirkers and cowards; so that the sum total of dissatisfaction may be very serious. Flat compulsion presumably removes that reciprocal grouch.

But there is still another factor working for compulsion in England. It has to do with conditions in the mobilized war industries, and explains the stand of Lloyd George for general conscription. It is well known that Lloyd George's success as Minister of Munitions has not been so complete as might be. The output of supplies has not attained the possible maximum. Baron Estournelles de Constant, after a recent visit to England, was quoted as saying that the English factory workers, while doing well, have not rendered their utmost, and that the nation as a whole has not fully realized the formidable nature of the task confronting the Allies. Baron de Constant spoke of the English people as not getting up early enough in the morning. The recent strikes on the Clyde show that perfect harmony in the industrial field has not been attained. With fuller powers under conscription, Lloyd George believes he can make a better showing. The bill promised by Mr. Asquith will undoubtedly give the authorities power for dealing more efficiently with the distribution of men between the battlefront and the munition factories, and for a prompter handling of the problem of exemptions from service than is possible under the present cumbersome system of local tribunals.

There are few better tests of sober patriotism than willingness to suffer heavy taxation when the country's need demands it, and this test has been borne by the people of Britain in exemplary fashion. In the current number of the London *Economist* a correspondent makes "a plea for a still higher income tax," which starts out with the statement that there has been "little or no criticism" of Mr. McKenna's recent budget, and this because people have thought it to be not less severe, but more severe, than it really is! The writer points out that the new income tax does not rise to five shillings in the pound—twenty-five per cent.—in so large a proportion of cases as is commonly supposed, and he urges that this rate should apply more widely than it does. It is to be noted that the motive for this particular kind of taxation in the present situation of the country is not solely the raising of needed revenue, but also the promotion of national economy through the cutting down of private expenditure for articles that are not necessaries. What moral exhortation to this end may accomplish in one case, the slicing off of one-fourth of a man's income will effect in fifty.

A more distinguished commercial travellers' expedition never set out in search of foreign trade than the Commission under the leadership of Secretary McAdoo, which returned to Washington last Thursday from South America. There have been individual promoters of trade of more exalted reputation, notably the Kaiser, in his voyages to the Near East and Morocco; but our own Commission comprised a Secretary of the Treasury, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, a member of the United States Senate, and special experts in finance, commerce, and industrial relations. From the summary of the Commission's work given to the press, it is plain that we have here something more than the ordinary fraternizing expedition which returns with ceremonial expressions of friendship and pious wishes and comparatively little of that solid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

information upon which the establishment of closer relations with the Latin-American markets must be based. Not that the ceremonial factor is to be despised. In the development of contact with South America, political considerations must enter. It is plain, for example, that the success of the mission will depend in large measure on our relations with Mexico. Secretary McAdoo's party was received by the Presidents of Argentina, Brazil, and Chili. These are the A B C Powers with whom we coöperated in the early stages of the Mexican difficulty. The attitude of the A B C nations in the field of trade will depend on the outcome in Mexico, and on whether the old distrust of Yankee ambitions can be replaced by full confidence in our political designs.

That the National Conservation Congress should have endorsed the Shields bill by a vote of 116 to 39 is a severe blow to Pinchot, Garfield, and other extreme conservationists. There was no division upon principles, but merely upon the interpretation of the Shields measure. The majority of the Conservation Congress plainly thought that its provisions could be accepted literally and in good faith. It meant what it said in giving the Government the right to take over private water-power plants on navigable streams at the end of fifty years at actual valuation. But ex-Secretary of the Interior Garfield was certain that the bill "turns over to private monopoly public power in perpetuity. The fifty years' limitation as proposed is nothing more than a mere fiction." The minority resolutions held that power sites should not be disposed of in perpetuity, but retained in Federal control. The majority made much of the fact that the Senate, after careful debate, had not seen in the bill the "mere fiction" of which Garfield spoke; and an even weightier consideration is that Secretary Lane has not done so. Upon details of the measure there may be disagreement, but its guarantee of a fifty years' tenure seems necessary to invite capital into a risky field.

Senator O'Gorman's announcement that he will not be a candidate for reëlection to the Senate is not altogether a surprise. He was chosen in the first place as a "way out" of the long deadlock in the Legislature caused by the attempt of the Tammany machine to force the election of William F. Sheehan. This was a half-victory for Murphy, but it was felt that Mr. O'Gorman would not be a Tammany tool, and in point of fact such proved to be the case. He was a strong advocate of the nomination of Woodrow Wilson for the Presidency in 1912, and worked towards that end both before and during the session of the Baltimore Convention, being almost alone among Tammany men in that position. In the Senate, too, he took an honorable position in several important matters. But it cannot be said that he fulfilled any high expectation that may have been entertained of his record in the Senate as a whole. He has been unhappy over matters of patronage, and one of his latest acts was the stand he took on the wrong side in the issue raised by the Gore resolution on the armed-merchantmen question. It ought to be possible to find a successor to him who will better measure up to the standards of statesmanship which ought to mark the representatives of the State of New York in the United States Senate.

The smashing victory of the Regular Republicans over the United Republicans in the California primaries is a distinct defeat for union under the leadership of Hiram Johnson. The Governor had endorsed the United Republican candidates for delegates to the Republican Convention at Chicago in a letter in which, while declaring his allegiance to the Progressive party "until that party shall cease to exist," he characterized the United Republican movement as "designed to bring Republicans and Progressives together nationally behind a nominee of the character that both Republicans and Progressives can, consistently with their principles, support. Your opponents," he continued, "publicly proclaim that they are against the nomination of such a man as the Progressives can or will support." These words meant simply that the election was a contest between Johnson and anti-Johnson Republicans. The result will not be taken as meaning that California Republicans are opposed to reunion, but only that they are opposed to surrender. Johnson, going to President Wilson for the phrase, had addressed himself to "every forward-looking man and woman in the Republican party." Evidently, that party is full of men and women who can see beyond him. The few thousand Bull Moose votes are negative testimony to the same effect.

A Roosevelt organ, the Chicago *Evening Post*, sings a very pæan for Mr. Root. He is "among the few greatest of American statesmen alive." He has a "first-rank intellect." His training and experience we "profoundly need." The reader rubs his eyes. What! is this Roosevelt-obsessed newspaper coming out for Root as President? Not exactly. "Mr. Root, even if nominated, could not be elected." "So bitter an indictment would be framed against him on his past record in domestic affairs that thousands upon thousands of voters in the ranks of labor and the party progressives would vote for the Democratic nominee instead of for Root." Why, then, heap all this praise upon him? Only to show what a splendid "lieutenant" he would be under the "old commander." It is absurd for a mere lieutenant to apply for "the captain's job." Captain? Field-Marshal, say we, General Staff, and War College all rolled into one. Anyhow, the point is, as made plain by the Chicago paper, that the friends of Root who have opened Presidential-campaign headquarters for him in New York are "misguided." His real candidacy, if he only knew it, is for the portfolio of foreign affairs. For that he would have the whooping support of all true Rooseveltians.

The Interior Department's experts have so often been accused of putting too bright a face on our future in the chemical industries that the Census Bureau's report on actual achievements in dye-making offers a valuable means of checking up the prophecies of Dr. Norton and others. As just made public, it shows that whereas there were four or five factories in 1914 capable of producing a limited amount of dyes, there are now thirty-three plants making coal-tar intermediates, and sixteen making intermediates and finished colors. Last year 15,000 tons of finished dyes were produced, of which 3,000 tons were aniline black. It may be hoped, according to the report, that America, by the end of the war, will have established on a permanent basis the manufacture of direct blacks, sulphur blacks, blues, and reds. In the light of these figures, there is nothing excessive in Dr. Norton's estimate last winter that by the end of 1916 we should be producing at the rate of 16,000 tons of dyes annually. The stride we have taken in the recovery of by-products of coking plants is indicated in the statement that the output of toluol rose between 1913 and 1916 from 3,200 tons to 22,400 tons. In many of the more elaborate dyes we are still suffering a famine, and shall be certain to do so as long as German imports are cut off. The 15,000 tons just released may not reach us, at least in considerable quantities, till after the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LARGER VIEW

First impressions of the German note, in reply to that of our Government, were inevitably displeasing. The document seems to have been deliberately composed so as to be, in manner, as unsatisfying as possible. The form was bad. The whole tone was grudging and unhandsome. Old and irrelevant controversies were threshed over needlessly. The concessions actually made were buried far down in the body of the note; and even to them qualifications and conditions were tied. Over-Sunday study, however, evidently brought a better feeling about the note to many American newspapers and to our public. Its offensiveness was still there. Its needlessly irritating quality did not disappear on second or third reading. And the conditions which it suggested remained impossible. But the mind went back to the essential fact that the German Government did, at bottom, accede to the demand of the United States that the unlawful use of submarines be abandoned. The American note to Germany was, in effect, an ultimatum. The German reply was, in effect, a yielding under duress. Nothing was left but to determine the way in which the American people and the American Government should accept and make use of this result.

The decision had to be made in a large way and on the highest grounds. Americans do not desire to score debating "points" against Germany. They do not desire to seek a quarrel if a quarrel can honorably be averted. We wish neither to strain the case so as to bring about a break with the German Government, nor to refrain from standing by the position we have deliberately and solemnly taken, merely in order to avoid such a breach. What the hour calls for is a calm consideration of the nation's deepest interests. Our Government does well to be jealous of our dignity and insistent upon our rights; but the questions which it has had to ask are simply these: How best can the judgment of this country be expressed? What is the most sagacious way of dealing with the situation created by the German note? By what broad and statesmanlike grasp of the opportunity and the duty now laid before the United States can this nation most surely make itself felt as a power for justice and humane principles in the conduct of the war, and for reason and appeasement when the war is over?

On one thing there was happily general agreement. This was that the German note was not a fighting reply. By itself it did not make a break in diplomatic relations inevitable. Several gentlemen of high reputation, and some newspapers wiser than seven men that can render a reason, were strongly for an immediate rupture with Germany. They professed to have seen through all the wiles of German diplomacy. The answer to us was a "transparent sham," a "trap," an "open insult," and so on. But the hard sense of the people is not for such rough-and-ready methods of disposing of a delicate and intricate question. The belief prevails that a way can be found to secure the great advantage we have obtained in our controversy with Germany. The terms she has offered in the main business can be accepted, it is felt, but only in a fashion to make it clear that they are to be accepted and carried out on our understanding of them, and not according to some interpretation which the Germans may be privately putting upon them.

How most effectively to do this is evidently the problem that weighed upon the President. But, as Tuesday showed us, he lost no time and wasted few words in replying to the German note. An official statement by our Government was obviously necessary. The President could not quietly accept the German surrender and, by silence, even appear to consent to the conditions with which the German Government sought to bind it up. The whole thing is now cleared up, so far as the Administration can clear it up. In language that is polite, yet unmistakable in meaning, the President accepts what is acceptable in the German offer, and rejects what is inadmissible. He puts the American understanding in clear and sharp terms. If Germany does not agree to this, she must say so. It is now *her* silence that will give consent. The general verdict in this country will be that Mr. Wilson could have done no less than he did, and that his words and manner were admirably fitted to his purpose. It cannot be said that all danger of friction is removed, or that further action may not be needed. But the onus is now on the German Government. It knows exactly what must be done and what avoided, in order to prevent a break with the United States. And we are convinced by the attitude and phrases of its note of last week that it has made up its mind to do whatever may be required to that end.

We can barely breathe an aspiration for what may lie beyond all the immediate negotiations. The message of the Pope to President Wilson, the language of the German note itself, many reports that come from the belligerent countries, encourage the hope that some great move for the proffer of good offices by neutrals, and of mediation to end the war, may soon begin. We know in what an anguished phrase the German note spoke of the possibility that "the cruel and sanguinary war" might be "extended and *prolonged*." We know how the longing for peace must be acute outside Germany. There is, as Cardinal Gibbons said on Sunday, "something in the air." What may come of it, we know not; but we may be sure that a far-sighted and even magnanimous course by our Government in dealing with Germany must help in the larger questions of possible peace, which may be thrust upon us sooner than we dream.

THE IRISH EXECUTIONS.

The English Government had ample justification in law for putting to death the leaders of the Irish rebellion, caught red-handed. Some reasons of policy also looked to a course of swift and stern dealing with these misguided men. It will be said that it was necessary to make treason odious. The Irish rebels had pulled a double noose on their necks, it may be argued, by not only taking up arms against England, but by doing it at a time when the very existence of the Empire was hazarded. Rather than a rebellion, the crazy Irish rising looks like a conspiracy with the enemies of Great Britain. Evidence of complicity with German plotters, and of the use of German money and arms, is alleged to be in the hands of the English Government. Thus the grounds for national resentment and the motives for merciless and exemplary punishment were both strong. Yet it was a mistake to yield to them. There could have been a more magnanimous, a wiser, a less impulsive, and more far-sighted method than placing the Irish rebels before a firing squad in the Tower. This, it seems to us, would have been dictated by a calm view of the history and nature of Irish discontent, and by a sagacious preparation for the future government of Ireland as a part of the Empire.

We are perfectly aware of all that will be urged in extenuation of the executions. The rebels did not truly represent the national attitude. The great majority of Irishmen condemned their insensate and traitorous outbreak. Whether in the northern or the southern provinces of Ireland, there was amazement at the mad act, and detestation of it. The freely elected representatives of Ireland in Parliament found in it only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"heartbreak and misery," in Mr. Redmond's phrase. For this murderous uprising was not like the historic Irish efforts to end tyrannous English rule. The mind of England towards Ireland has undergone a change. The chief Irish grievances were in the way of being redressed. A plan of Home Rule for Ireland, acceptable to Irish Nationalists, had been got through the English Parliament—even in the face of threatened resistance by force in the North of Ireland—and Irish hopes were high and bright. Yet this was the time when England's extremity was seized upon, in conjunction with England's foes, to drench Ireland with blood! We admit that the provocation to deal harshly with the offenders was extreme. The British authorities were well within the law, both civil and military. But not all things that are lawful are expedient; and we think that time will show the Irish executions to have been a blunder in public policy.

It at once presents the Irish people with some new "martyrs." The names of Pearse and the others will hereafter be associated infallibly with Tone and Emmet and the "Manchester martyrs" and all those who have had a warm place in Irish hearts as the victims, actual or supposed, of English oppression and ferocity. To throw such inflammable stuff into the fires of Irish national feeling cannot be wise. There are only two courses open to English statesmen in fronting Ireland. What they are, Macaulay pointed out in his speech in the House of Commons in 1844. They are, on the one hand, the policy of Cromwell "strong, straightforward, and cruel"—repression, coercion, virtual extirpation; and on the other the humane and liberal policy which took for its first postulate the principle that it was impossible for two nations to live intermingled filled with desperate hate of each other. Everything which perpetuates and intensifies that hate is against the best interests of the state; and if this truth had been held clearly in mind by the English Government, we believe that it would have taken a lesson from the United States in the right way of dealing with rebels overcome. If the Irish rebellion was—as it looks to be—a mere affair of lunatic leaders and duped followers, then the sounder course was to lock up the guilty men in jails, or put them in insane asylums, and let time and second thought do their work.

As regards the other Irish rebels now in custody, it is apparently the purpose of the Government to be lenient. John Redmond's plea is only for the deceived rank and file of rebels. Little has been heard from Belfast, but a demand for vengeance from that quarter would be too absurd even for a North of Ireland man, after the threatened civil war of 1914. Sir Edward Carson is not saying much these days. If he approves the execution of Pearse, he must admit that it would have been right to try and hang himself for treason, two years ago. Belfast cannot do with impunity what was attempted in Dublin and bloodily put down. By so much—in its sobering effect on Ulster—the sharp dealing with the Irish rebellion may have a good result in the future. But we fear that the dream of a united and contented Ireland, to which Secretary Birrell so pathetically confessed as the reason why he had not earlier laid the heavy hand of the Government upon Irish plotters, will be a long time unrealized.

THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE CURE-ALL.

In the years to come none of the many amazing phenomena of 1916 will, we are sure, cause greater wonderment than our recent discovery that universal military service is the cure-all for every one of our American ills. Do we wish to defend our country? We have but to adopt the system of training every boy to be a soldier, and the problem is solved. Do we wish to become industrially efficient? Then let us forget all about vocational training, but give every American a year under arms, and presto! we shall outdo Germany in scientific efficiency and management. Is our youth lawless and undisciplined? Universal compulsory service will end that once for all. Is our democracy halting? It is the tonic of a democratic army that we need, in which all men shall pay for the privileges of citizenship by a year of preparation for poisonous gas and of learning how to shoot. Our melting-pot is a failure? Then let us pour into it the iron metal of militarism, and it will fuse every element at once. Finally, if we need an American soul—and the war has suddenly taught us that this glorious country lacks a soul—it is the remedy of universal military service that is to supply our spiritual needs and give us the ability to feel as one, to think as one, to steer towards our destiny as of one mind.

It is all so alluring and so entrancingly easy, the wonder is that we have never thought of it before. We saw it going on in France and Germany and Russia, but it seemed altogether repulsive in its forms. Americans to be conscripted? Heaven forbid. There rose before us the unutterable cruelties of non-commissioned officers and some of the officers—visions of the men who have come to our shores with hands mutilated to avoid the barracks, with their open immoralities, their bitter hardships, the loss of three years of so many working lives. The "Red Rosa," Rosa Luxembourg, with her 10,000 authenticated instances of cruelties to German soldiers, inflicted by their own countrymen behind the screen of official authority, explained to us why so many young Germans emigrated before coming of military age. We saw in universal Russian service a complete reason for the failure of the Russian revolution, for the survival of the corrupt bureaucratic government. We knew of men of noble spirit in every land crushed by the whole system. We saw in the development of the Prussian military clique not merely the fine flower of militarism, but the true fruits of universal service. We recalled, too, James Madison's belief that "large armies and heavy taxes are the best-known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few."

But it now seems that we were mistaken in all this; that our failure to progress financially, economically, and spiritually as rapidly as we should have done has been due solely to our failure to grasp at the panacea that lay so easily within reach. Take the education of our boys. The other day at a joint meeting of two schoolmasters' associations there were divided views on some issues, but none apparently as to the utter lawlessness of our American youth and the complete failure of our private schools to reduce them to subordination by means of mental and moral discipline. And so there were many who grasped with joy at the idea of the universal-military-drill to retrieve for them the ground lost by their own failure to do the fundamental thing they pledged themselves to accomplish. Of course, they knew little or nothing about universal service; perhaps it was the unexplored mystery of it that appealed. Many Americans are quite sure that the latest untried remedy, be it some law, or the initiative and referendum, or the recall of judicial decisions, or some other panacea, is, by reason of its very newness, just the medicine for a given ill they have been looking for. So with these school-teachers. Ignoring the fact that our private military schools have been anything

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but popular, and only in exceptional cases of high standing, they turn to military drill as to a last straw. One can admire their courage while marvelling at their judgment. Fortunately, those particular teachers heard the European system of a nation in arms denounced by one of their number, who had served in Austria both as private and as officer.

For what they do not see any more than the Stanwood Menkens who, never having borne arms, yet know that universal service is what we need to make patriots by the million, is that the spirit of compulsory service makes directly against the American ideal, for it inculcates blind obedience to the will of others, subordination to those who are masters not necessarily because of superior wisdom or fitness, but largely because of accident. It often means cringing before men who abuse their power, particularly over men of finer instincts and antecedents —just as the late Karl Bitter was driven to desert from the Austrian service by intolerable persecutions. It is not without significance that there is a suicide a day among the private soldiers in the German army in time of peace—no record being kept of unsuccessful attempts at self-destruction. Again, as Major-Gen. O'Ryan, of the New York National Guard, has put it, the primary thing that military service teaches is that the soldier shall *stop thinking* and become an automaton—to do only what his officers tell him. And usually there is a steadily widening cleft between him and those officers.

Once we valued American self-assertiveness, independence of thought and action, mental alertness, yes, even the happy-go-lucky Yankee initiative and individuality, as some of our best characteristics. Now we are to prefer men cast in one mould, drilled in one way of thinking, and into obedience to their rulers. Formerly, we deemed it most worth while that all men should have their own opinions, express them freely, and differ with their rulers as they saw fit—since their rulers were but their servants. As for making patriots, universal military service makes Socialists and deserters. There is nothing whatsoever democratic about it, save that it applies to all men alike. Where universal service is most efficient, there is every kind of distinction as to regiments and individuals. The peasant serves three years, the "gentleman" one. The favors shown to the Guard regiments in Germany have led to more than one bitter debate in the Reichstag. What can there be democratic about an army? Its whole fundamental principle is that of a hierarchy in which everybody responds automatically and blindly to the will of a commander-in-chief. What system could be more directly opposed to the democratic theory?

HARVARD'S BOARD OF OVERSEERS.

Nominations for the Board of Overseers of Harvard University of candidates to be elected at Commencement in June confirm the prevailing trend in the selection of men connected, either as lawyers or managers, with large corporate enterprises. Thus, among the nominees is Mr. J. P. Morgan; another is Mr. F. L. Higginson, jr., of Lee, Higginson & Co.; another is Congressman Samuel E. Winslow, head of many large corporations; a fourth is Howard Elliott, president of the New Haven Railroad; a fifth is William Thomas, head of and attorney for many Pacific Coast corporations; a sixth is the head of some large Indiana companies, while a seventh is a member of the firm of Stone & Webster; an eighth is president of the Old Colony Trust Company. Of the other candidates, the Rev. S. S. Drury is vice-rector of St. Paul's School, three others are prominent Boston lawyers, one a New York stock-broker, one a physician, and the last is Mr. M. A. De Wolfe Howe, whose position as a man of letters needs no setting forth. He, Dr. Balch, and Mr. Drury are the only ones of the fifteen candidates not affiliated with large companies.

Turning to the present Harvard Board of Overseers, we may classify its members as follows: Capitalists, 11; men of letters, 2; educators, 3; public men, 3 (Roosevelt, Lodge, and Delano); physicians, 2; lawyers, 7; social worker, 1; and clergyman, 1; a total of 30. Some of the lawyers having served or serving as heads of large corporations might properly be catalogued as capitalists. Mr. Delano was formerly a railway president. The educators are ex-President Eliot, President Hyde of Bowdoin College, and Prof. George H. Palmer—an astonishingly small list when one considers the variety of educational problems with which the Board deals. Of the 30 members, 14 live in Boston or Cambridge, or elsewhere in Massachusetts, while two live in the District of Columbia, six in New York, two in Pennsylvania, and one each in Oregon, Kentucky, Maine, Illinois, Maryland, and Missouri—a marked change since 1879, in which year the Rev. Dr. Henry W. Bellows was elected from New York as the first non-resident of Massachusetts ever to sit as a member of the Overseers. Then, as now, the nominations were made by a committee appointed by the Harvard Alumni Association. If, therefore, the trend of the nominations runs towards men connected with what is known as "big business," the Alumni Association's committees bear the primary responsibility. The graduates themselves weed out five of the fifteen suggested by the Association's committee, the ten receiving the largest number of votes in the postcard canvass being printed on the official ballot on Commencement Day. Of these ten, five are finally chosen.

Now, it goes without saying that some of the most useful members of the Overseers are men of large financial connections and experience. Mr. J. P. Morgan, for instance, has already served as Overseer for one term, and most acceptably. Mr. Hodges is the popular president of the New York Harvard Club, whom Harvard men delight to honor, just as the College is proud of Howard Elliott and his efforts to make the New Haven a model American railway. The Board of Overseers does not merely have to deal with matters scholastic; financial problems also figure—and largely. Money-raising is often one of its duties, while the problems of administration call for the same talents necessary in the management of large corporations. To say, therefore, that men of large affairs ought not to serve Harvard would be absurd; she needs among her counsellors men of that type. The danger is, however, that too many men of a single class and point of view may be chosen in the course of the natural desire to select successful men, men of power and influence, to forward the interests of the University.

The question is the more serious because of the constant efforts at Harvard to minimize the charge that it is a rich man's university, and because of President Lowell's praiseworthy efforts to democratize the undergraduates by the building of the freshman dormitories and in many other ways. Statistics of the amounts earned by students working their way through, and of the small expenditures by many men who win their degrees, are constantly published to show that the expensive dormitories on Mt. Auburn Street are not the real Harvard. Scholarships in increasing number are offered by the Harvard Clubs of the country to deserving students in need of aid to obtain their education. But will not this in large degree be offset, in the West at least, if it appears that by a considerable majority the Over-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seers represent the point of view of State Street and Wall Street?

Similar objections would lie if a majority comprised men in political life, while a preponderance of literary men and teachers would also be open to criticism. The point is that, in Harvard's enormous alumni constituency, the majority are not men of great wealth or highly successful metropolitan practitioners at the bar, but men of average competence and success, widely scattered over the country, and imbued with the real spirit of democracy. All the more reason, it would seem, to democratize the Overseers, to reduce the number of presidents of banks and trust companies, capitalists, and attorneys, less because of any distrust of them than because of a desire to make certain that the Overseers represent the spirit and the aspirations of the mass of men who hold Harvard degrees; that in building a university they shall be less concerned with the means of acquiring wealth, or even with the maintaining of existing institutions, than with the search for truth, the making of a college which shall above all else be progressive and forward-looking—eager to point the way to a nobler and more spiritual democracy. The responsible officials of the Alumni Association should earnestly address themselves to the question of a broader representation in the Overseers.

Foreign Correspondence

THE FUTURE OF JAPANESE SHINTOISM.

By YONE NOGUCHI.

TOKIO, April 2.

A highly interesting question has recently come up in the revival of the late General Count Nogi's family by the Imperial appointment of Mr. Motosato Mori to succeed that extinct family with a newly bestowed countship; the social aspect of the question was deepened and dignified by its having a spiritual or religious, that is, Shintoic, reference at its base. As people in the West may know, we have a strange family system, certainly unheard of in the Western countries, in "adoption," the *raison d'être* of which is principally to prevent the extinction of families and the consequent neglect of the spirits of the departed; and we should adhere faithfully to it so long as we endorse ancestor-worship in the hope of being protected, as we believed in the olden days, from any evil or misfortune by its virtue. Now our General Count Nogi, one of the greatest heroes that brighten the pages of the Russo-Japanese War, who took his own life at the moment of national grief in the late Mikado's death, not believing in the system of adoption, which he called unnatural and even unreasonable, left his will to the effect that his distinguished family should become extinct for lack of an heir, as his two sons had died on the bloody field of Manchuria. Did he deny, one may ask, the Shintoism which rises and falls with the important doctrine of ancestor-worship? And to whose hand did he wish to entrust the observance of the festivals of his own ancestors and the keeping of their graves free from grasses? As a strong believer in insular independence of nationalism, the General Count Nogi's action, at least in denying "adoption," was certainly inconsistent; he left perhaps in spite of himself a proof of his disapproval of Shintoism. But, on the other hand, we have a powerful reason for refusing to sanction the appointment of a person (although he be a younger brother of Viscount Mori, of whose family the late General Count was a retainer in feudal days) to revive the famous warrior's family, even though it was spoken augustly by the Emperor.

The essence of ancestor worship should be, of course, in the very beauty of the personal communication with the spirits of the departed; their protection is transcendentally divine while it keeps, on the other hand, a human actuality. Indeed, ancestor-worship reveals its living power in our belief that the worldly aspect of the ancestral spirits, though invisible, will be kept as in their lives. And the spirit of the late undaunted fighter of Port Arthur fame lives in our Japanese mind as real as yesterday; what will he say, we wonder, when his spirit sees an unwelcome successor stepping over his threshold? Surely, it is not far from wrong to say that he would not justify any person, even the young son of his former master's family, as a successor, when he laughed over and criticised the system of "adoption" in his life; to respect the belief of the departed and to act accordingly would be the true meaning of adherence to Shintoism. It seems that the Imperial Japanese House, of course with good intention, in appointing a successor to the Nogi family acted rather carelessly; with the late General, who, we might say, acted against the Shintoic conception, it also violated the true meaning of Shintoism. And we have in this case an evidence of the general confusion in the conception of ancestor-worship in present Japan.

As the world knows, the religion of the Imperial Japanese House (supposing it has any religion) is Shintoism, or the belief in the "Way of the Gods," and it is true to say that it is, in fact, the real personification of that Shintoism, since the first powerful goddess it recognized was the grandmother of the Deity Ninigi, whose son or grandson in Jimmu was the first human Emperor of Japan. Therefore the Imperial House, even of the present time, is supposed to be the direct descendant of the ancient goddess. To pay homage to the gods or to the departed ancestors of the Imperial family is, needless to say, the most important precept of Shintoism, which has neither moral code nor sacred book like any other religion of the world; the mere worshipping of the ancestors for the divine protection is said to be sufficient for the innate perfection of Japanese humanity, whose wisdom is pleased to obviate the necessity of outward props in ritual or thought. Whenever the Imperial House happens to keep a festival or celebration, as in the recent Coronation or Ascension Ceremony, it will at once appear with all the revived dignities of Shintoism and make us forget, temporarily, the fact that we have been embracing in other days some other religion, Christianity or Buddhism. It is both right and wise for the Imperial House to remind us that it is the very descendant of the ancient god or goddess; certainly this is the strongest self-protection it could find. So long as our Japanese minds do not wholly depart from the belief in Shintoism, the Imperial House will be kept up, I believe, as the Japanese centre of devotion or patriotism. But there is unmistakable evidence of agitation in the general conception of Shintoism or ancestor-worship in the Japanese minds of to-day, and one wonders how the belief in Shintoism, simple and archaic, can harmonize with modern education, how the conception of ancestor-worship can keep its compactness against the changing conditions of our lives in present Japan.

The fact that modern civilization is driving away people from the birthplaces of their own ancestors is certainly weakening the conception of ancestor-worship in that it deprives them of opportunities for observing the religious rites towards departed spirits. Again, the atmosphere of a city, exciting and unpoetically scientific, does not tend to cherish the somewhat ghostly and shadowy sense of ancestor-worship. Of those who move to a foreign country, for instance to America, where there is more stress on the living communities than on those of the spirits, it is not too much to say that they will be glad to make a fresh start in life by forgetting the past ages and departed spirits. A good example of this was Viscount Mori, then the Minister of Education, who was stabbed by Nishino on the day of the proclamation of the Constitution in 1889, when the question arose whether the Japanese would lose their belief in Shintoism or ancestor-worship from a long foreign residence. It is said that Viscount Mori, who was extraordinarily "free-thinking" for Japan of that time, stepped into the old shrine at Isé, where the divine looking-glass of the goddess Amatorasu is enshrined, wearing foreign boots, and raised a sacred curtain of the shrine with his stick. His act cost him his life, which was snatched away by Nishino, a fervent Shintoist.

Furthermore, the main families in the old patriarchal system are already dying out in present Japan, and a branch family cannot be expected to be so devotional to the thought of the ancestors. There are also the modern tendency of individualism and the evolutional theory, which incline to encourage the idea of regarding the descendants as superior to and greater than the ancestors themselves.

A more important factor in weakening the sense of ancestor-worship is, I should say, the expression of the ancestral spirits itself; I mean that the conception of ancestor-worship would be more harshly wounded by the inner destitution than by the outward menace. When the ancestral spirits cannot reveal their worldly action as in their lives, bestowing on us physical prosperity and peace, our modern minds, more or less touched by science and philosophy, would only recognize them through our emotion; such a sense will be real and true as far as the imaginative reality goes. Indeed, such a sense of emotional feeling towards the ancestors might be heightened and intensified, when a rare occasion demands, so as to become a mysterious consciousness of religion. It is far from my mind to say that the Shintoism realized by an emotional sense is less effective; what

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I dare say here is that the ancestor-worship as a religion is a sort of religion, even when it is highly encouraged by the Imperial House, that is becoming a thing of the past.

If the sense of ancestor-worship as a religious consciousness loses its own power, the next question we must think of is what will be the effect on the so-called Japanese patriotism or devotion to the Imperial House; if the religious devotion should become even a moral consciousness, our world-famous loyalty to the Throne, if we still keep it then, should be understood differently. But it is too early now to discuss this matter as an actual question. What I want to emphasize in this short article is that even the Imperial House would be powerless against our changing conception of ancestor-worship. The spiritual insularity which once has been broken cannot be so easily mended.

THE RESULTS OF THE WAR—WOMAN AND WORKMEN.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, April 22.

When people had their hints for daily life from Scripture, they noticed that the capable woman took from her treasures new things before the old. This war imitates her example.

The old order changeth, yielding place to new.

The poet of the Roman order, which changed the face of the world, saw in it rather the total renewal of some ancient Golden Age:

Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.

We Americans should be content if the peoples whom our fathers left to manage Europe unassisted would now look to our ancient Ideal. Whether Reality among us corresponds with that Ideal is another story—but it is a great deal to have kept the Ideal. Nothing is of greater present interest to us than to know how the war is already bringing the world to look our way.

I can speak only of France and the French. What is war already working among them by way of change?

First, Woman is taking the place of Man at his work. It is now by necessity, but after the war it will be by force of habit and because she rejoices in her independence. It is not perhaps the American way, for that seems to exempt the woman from labor, while the Frenchwoman is earning her place by hard labor of her hands.

If three beings—the man, his wife, and their beast of burden—should go forth to cut fagots for their fire, the homecoming might be in this wise: in Italy the man would ride upon the beast and the woman would bear the fagots on her shoulders; in America the man would carry the fagots and the woman would ride; in France the beast would bear the burden and man and wife would trudge home together. Perhaps this is unfair, perhaps it is pre-history. The Frenchwoman has always gone forth with her husband to their work in the morning unto the evening. Now that he is at the war, she has taken his place and does his work as well as her own.

This is the sum of reports from agricultural associations in every region of France which is not occupied by German armies. It was proposed that a medal should be given to peasant women working their farms while their husbands are fighting at the front. "We should have to send the names of all of them—for all merit the reward," was the answer of one despairing committee.

It is the same, more or less, in towns and in the great city of Paris. The street-cars might be in Valparaiso of Chili, for women conduct them—and, in case of need, control. Sunday is a holiday from work and a day of temptation for certain liable to fall, but happily not numerous in Paris. An elderly man titubates with an air of profound worthiness on the car platform. Twice the conductress aids to the reëstablishing of his equilibrium as the car swerves. The third time she remonstrates with him, in no undertone: "Ah, then, how am I going to collect fares if I have to hold you up?" With a look of pain, he subsides into a supporting corner.

Most of these women have never heard that there could be any question of their voting, although suffragist societies do exist in Paris and elsewhere in France. I am sure they would all vote just as cheerfully as they go to work, if they thought it any use. They are not reaching out to any American ideal in that line—but they are working up to one which American women do not always appreciate. This is, not to lord it over the man, but to be independent of him where money is concerned. When illustrated publications were new in the United States and women were only beginning to talk in public about their rights, one of the early *Harper's* had a picture, in which I think Miss Lucy Stone (as she then was) announced to her convention: "No woman should be allowed to marry until she can support her husband."

This is supposed, inexactly enough, to be the object of the *dot* without which few Frenchwomen can be married in any class of society. In reality, the French husband has always had to have his *dot* also, that is, an equivalent in money or settled revenue or advantageous position for the dowry which his wife brings—not to him, for he cannot use it alone—but to their community of two. For that matter, a French father of a family who has earned his own fortune cannot spend it freely—for he runs the danger of some clear-sighted relative calling a family council without his knowledge and getting a judge to put a trustee over him before he knows what is going on.

A Frenchman who writes plays and ought to know something about workaday life has the idea that woman's independence through her work will do away with the institution of the *dot*. "When my wife and I were married, we had twenty-five dollars and all the world before us," said one of America's rich men in Paris. That is what reformers like Brieux are predicting for France—after the war—if women go on as they have begun.

It is curious that women, who are thus working out their independence unconsciously, were not discontented, at least not articulately, in France before the war. On the contrary, workmen were. Now it is foreseen that their position, too, will change as a result of the war. In spite of France being a democracy—as democratic as the United States in many ways, often more so—the social distinction of classes has been for the workmen little short of a difference of caste. The institution of the *dot* helped to this, for the difference came from the close circle thrown around families by laws of property. It is long since nobles, who have no legal privileges, counted in France, but the possession of property which constitutes essentially all *bourgeoisie* amounts to a class privilege.

It has been easier for the French workman to push his children into the professions and the university, into politics and Parliament and government, than to break through into the property-holding circle. Hence the war of classes became a possible label for Socialist agitation. And as some such distinction between capital and labor exists all through the modern world, it became possible to turn Socialism into an Internationale. Now a second result of this war is the setback it has already given to all internationalisms.

The Kaiser sends his Cardinal Hartmann to Brussels under orders not to foregather with the Belgian Cardinal Mercier. Wilfred Monod, of the noted French Protestant family of many preachers and a leader in universal pacifism, explains the patriotic attitude of himself and all his in this war as the necessary choice of a lesser evil. In fact, they have been fighting and been shot down literally by the dozen. So, in December, all sections of French Socialists and Syndicalists repudiated the private action of two of their number who took part with German Socialists in a palaver about possible peace at Zimmerwald. And now an immense majority, more than two-thirds, have voted against international relations even when war is over—until German Socialists are surely converted from Prussian militarism.

Here, then, is another lasting result of war—Whoso is not against the Kaiser is with him.

Notes from the Capital

WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH.

Of the five Smiths in the Senate, the one with the smallest frame and the largest aspirations is he of Michigan, well known everywhere by his given names, William Alden. The Michigan Smith, being a Yankee of the Yankees and a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, has as great a distaste for the present Administration as the Georgia Smith, being an original "discoverer" of Mr. Wilson, has admiration for it. Whatever the President may do, William Alden is ready with his criticism. The attitude assumed towards Mexico was so paltering as to bring our national name into contempt and make every foreign Government feel that it may mistreat ours with impunity. The attitude assumed towards Germany was bringing us perilously near war, which was a catastrophe the American people would not "stand for" inviting. *And so on.*

If enough of this sort of thing could be kept up to drive Mr. Wilson out of the White House at the close of his present term, where should we look for a satisfactory successor? Ahem! Could any one ask such a question in good faith? The recent primary election in Michigan was intended to answer it, and the fact that the answer was not all that was expected must not be regarded as settling the fate of the Smith boom, by any means. Smith is just as chipper since as he was before the momentous vote. Indeed, all that he has in the world, and all that he is, he owes to his faculty of being chipper in the teeth of every difficulty, and keeping

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everlastingly at it when he has made up his mind to accomplish something. What becomes of a pigmy like Ford in a contest with such a monster of persistency?

The secret of Smith's rise to his present prominence lies in his refusal to take "no" for an answer from Dame Fortune. His origin was humility itself. Thrown on his own resources while still in the short-trousers stage, he made a modest livelihood by selling newspapers, peanuts, and popcorn on a local railway in Michigan. Coming thus into friendly contact with the train-dispatchers at the stations, he picked up by degrees a crude knowledge of telegraphy, which he improved as he might by regular study in odd hours till he could obtain temporary employment as an operator. Acquiring in the meantime a considerable acquaintance among men of standing who took a fancy to his pushing spirit, he induced some of them to interest themselves in his behalf with the presiding officers of the State Legislature, and thus, after a hard struggle, won an appointment as a page in the lower house. In this place he could listen to speeches all day long, and observe some of the tricks of oratory at so close range that they lost their mystery for him. The experience led him to decide to prepare himself for the bar, with an ultimate view to politics and practical law-making. But to whom could he look for help over the first hard places?

This question he answered by installing himself, without so much as a "By your leave," in the office of a well-known firm of country practitioners, as general utility boy, during the temporary absence of both partners. If prospective clients came in, he would ascertain their names and errands, question them about the business they wished to transact, and the like, making careful notes of everything. When the partners returned, their indignant surprise at discovering this young interloper on their premises was turned to approbation when they learned how he had been employing his time for their benefit, and he received a clerkship without more ado. They directed his studies, stood his sponsors for admission to practice, and stayed his stanch friends till he could get started well on his independent course. From that point he had comparatively little difficulty in making his own way, and the step from law to politics was short and easy. It is interesting to note that when he went up to Lansing to plead for his pageship he was so poor that he could not pay his carfare, and had to "beat" his trip through, the conductors of train after train putting him off by the roadside, and finally leaving him to make the last long lap of the route by walking, so that he reached his destination not only cold and hungry, but physically worn out. Fifteen years later he was riding back and forth over the same line in his private car, as general counsel for the whole system to which that road belonged!

It would be a safe wager that Smith never will attain the present goal of his ambition, the Presidency; but the insurmountable obstacle to his success will not be insufficient effort, or self-depreciation, or uncertainty about what he proposes to do. Give him overnight to think about it, and he will hand you in the morning a careful summary of an administrative policy covering his four years as President, and possibly throw in an appendix to cover the second term on which he is confidently figuring. His short suit in the big political game is personality. Although he bears himself with dignity of manner, it is the dignity of the prize bantam rather than of the eagle. His face, with its grayish tones and its squirrel-like shrewdness, is not particularly forceful, while his frame conveys no such suggestion of the Little Giant as made Douglas tower in the popular imagination in inverse ratio to his actual inches and weight. His oratory is more resonant than informative or convincing. In short, where La Follette failed for lack of a dominant personality, William Alden Smith can hardly hope to win. Still, it is the proud boast of Americans of the William Alden Smith type that the highest office in the gift of the people is open to any native citizen who can muster the necessary votes; so is there the slightest reason in the world why Smith should not try his luck with the rest? TATTLER.

Contraband

By ELLERY C. STOWELL.

It is not difficult to set forth with considerable precision the nature and definition of contraband, nor to discover the limits of the twilight zone beyond the well-defined region of the law. When the belligerent goes beyond this intermediate region of doubtful legality, he depends upon his naked might alone. In the present circumstances, however, when Great Britain's seizures of neutral commerce bear no resemblance to any one of the well-recognized rights of confiscation, such as are permitted for the violation of blockade, the carriage of contraband, or engaging in unneutral service, any discussion of those measures seems academic. Great Britain frankly applies a system of reprisals against Germany, and attempts to maintain a stranglehold upon her enemy. To this end she detains, requisitions, or preëmpts all neutral goods which are likely to interfere with the success of her attempt to starve her enemy into submission. It would be interesting to analyze the reasons why Great Britain has not adopted the simple expedient of officially designating her operations as an international law blockade and of then violating the ordinary rules of blockade so as to extend these operations and intercept commerce bound to Germany through neutral ports. Great Britain has semi-officially spoken of her operations as a "blockade," making use of the term as it is popularly employed to designate any measures effective to intercept trade bound for the enemy; but she has never attempted to institute a blockade under international law, although there has been a strong body of public opinion urging such action upon the Government. Perhaps England fears to establish a precedent for a new kind of blockade which might be turned against the British Isles at some future time. Another reason for not trifling with blockade may well be that the law of blockade is much better defined and easier to understand than that of contraband, especially for those not trained in international law. As a consequence of this lack of definiteness in the regulation of contraband, the disregard of the rules of contraband is less likely to shock that respect for law which is dear to all peoples.

I.

Although Mr. Pyke* does not propose any adequate solution, or seem to recognize that what Great Britain is now employing is not the system of contraband, but an "interdict" upon neutral trade, his careful study of the questions involved, even though it be a brief for England, is instructive. The tendency of his work is fittingly summarized by the remark in his preface: "The foundation of the law of contraband is 'the right of a belligerent to prevent certain goods from reaching the country of the enemy for his military use.'" If we could accept this assertion adopted from the decision in the case of the Kim, delivered by Sir Samuel Evans, president of the British Prize Court, as true, we should inevitably be led to the conclusion that all the measures which England has taken to throttle German commerce are justifiable and strictly legal. But a partisan defender of neutral rights, blinded to the requirements of belligerent operations, might assert with equal boldness: "The foundation of the law of contraband is the right of a neutral to continue his commerce with both belligerents." Each of these assertions is a half-truth which leaves out of account the other. The true foundation of contraband is a compromise intermediate between these extreme views. If only we could accept either of these partisan views, we should have a principle from which we could easily derive a logical system of consistent rules to govern the application of the law of contraband. Unfortunately for such logic, the foundation of contraband persists in being what it is—a compromise.

This compromise is the result of a struggle centuries long between belligerents, on the one hand, who have wished to cut off all trade with their enemy, and neutrals, on the other, who have wished not only to preserve their normal trade, but to take advantage of the favorable situation for securing a lucrative increase of their seaborne commerce.

The best method of understanding this compromise regulation of contraband is to regard it from the point of view of the proof required to show that the articles alleged to be contraband are in the course of transportation to the armed forces of the enemy; for we can never speak of "contraband" unless the goods in question are at one and the same time of a nature to be useful to sustain military forces and operations and are actually in the course of being transported to a military destination. Of course, it is to be expected that the belligerent gov-

**The Law of Contraband of War.* By H. Reason Pyke. Oxford University Press. $4.15 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment and the neutral shipper will take every precaution to disguise this destination to the forces of the enemy, and if the belligerent were required to establish conclusively the proof that the specific articles were actually destined to supply the enemy's forces, he would never be able to effect a seizure. This difficulty in regard to the burden of proof is solved, like many another legal difficulty, by the application of a presumption which is accepted by the prize court in lieu of the proof of that hostile military destination which has itself been recognized as the fundamental basis of the right to seize and confiscate.

In the course of a long evolutionary process, various presumptions in regard to this proof of hostile military destination have been adopted and recognized as having a status in international law. For example, it has been considered reasonable to assume that a cargo of gunpowder destined for the territory of the enemy is more certainly intended to reach belligerent forces than shipments of grain or other articles which are employed largely for the purposes of peace as well as those of war. International law has accordingly recognized this difference of fact by permitting the belligerent captor to apply, in the case of gunpowder and other articles adapted exclusively for the purposes of war, a much broader presumption than would be allowed in the case of the other category of articles, *ancipitis usus*—that is to say, those which are important for peaceful purposes as well as for war. They are generally designated as *conditional* or *relative contraband*, although *conditionally contraband* is a preferable terminology. Such, for example, are grain and cotton.

In résumé, then, we may say that certain articles used exclusively or preponderantly for the purposes of war are denominated as absolute contraband, and are liable to confiscation when shown to be bound for the enemy's forces, or so presumed in accordance with the presumptions authorized by international law as administered by prize courts. It is only necessary for the belligerent to show that the articles in question are actually destined to belligerent territory to permit him to confiscate them. Furthermore, to facilitate this proof for belligerents, all goods of the nature of contraband found upon the high seas may be presumed to have a belligerent destination, unless it is clearly shown by the papers which accompany them that they have an actual bona-fide neutral destination.

In regard to those articles known as conditional contraband or articles conditionally contraband, which is the better designation, the belligerent is not permitted to enjoy the same easy presumption to establish a hostile military destination. An examination of the law of contraband shows that these articles, useful alike for the purposes of war and of peace, may not be presumed to have a hostile destination to the forces of the enemy, simply because they are bound for the enemy's territory. Proof must also be furnished that the goods are destined to the forces of the enemy.

II.

A somewhat lengthy digression is necessary to explain this second set of supplemental presumptions, which took form and obtained recognition before the great extension and cheapening of land transportation.

In the leading cases of the Jonge Margaretha (1799) and the Neptunus (1800), the illustrious British prize judge, Lord Stowell, discussed the proof of a hostile military destination in the case of articles conditionally contraband, and adopted as a basis of such proof a presumption founded upon the prevailing character of the port of the enemy to which the goods were destined. In the former case, Lord Stowell held that a cargo of cheese, bound from neutral Amsterdam to the enemy port of Brest, was contraband, because, he said:

> . . . if the port is a general commercial port, it shall be understood that the articles were going for civil use, although occasionally a frigate or other ships of war may be constructed in that port. On the contrary, if the great predominant character of a port be that of a port of naval military equipment, it shall be intended that the articles were going for military use, although merchant ships resort to the same place, and although it is possible that the articles might have been applied to civil consumption; for it being impossible to ascertain the final application of an article *ancipitis usus*, it is not an injurious rule which deduces both ways the final use from the immediate destination . . . (1 C. Robinson, pp. 194-195, cited by H. R. Pyke, p. 119).

Applying the same rule in the case of the Neptunus, Lord Stowell refused to condemn tallow bound to the port of Amsterdam, since Amsterdam was a great mercantile port, as well as a port of naval equipment (3 C. Rob. 108; Pyke, p. 119).

As late as the Boer War, Lord Salisbury expressed the official view of the British Government to the effect that "foodstuffs with a hostile destination can be considered contraband of war only if they are supplies for the enemy's forces. It is not sufficient that they are capable of being so used; it must be shown that this was, in fact, their destination at the time of their seizure" (Parliamentary Papers, Africa No. 1 [1900], p. 16; Pyke, p. 133).

During the Russo-Japanese War, when Russia issued a contraband proclamation which seems very mild in the light of recent experience, Mr. Pyke well says: "As a result, however, of the vigorous protests of the British and United States Governments, which insisted that goods primarily used for peaceful purposes could be treated as contraband only when actually and specially destined for the armed forces of the enemy, Russia modified her original proclamation so far as to admit the conditionally contraband character of rice, provisions, horses, beasts of burden, and other animals, which were to be seized only when destined for the Government of the enemy, or his administration, army, navy, fortresses, naval ports, or purveyors" (p. 135).

The compromise system of contraband, as now recognized by the law of nations, was established at a period when land transportation was difficult. The military advantage of interrupting the belligerent supply of articles of conditional contraband, serviceable alike for purposes of peace and war, had then (under ordinary circumstances) much less importance in determining the success of military operations. Under the old conditions of the localization of markets, seizure of contraband could not be as effectively distorted to cut off the necessities of life and bring distress on the peaceful inhabitants. Yet the rights of contraband as then applied did permit a belligerent to cut off that portion of the sea-borne commerce which was most helpful to his adversary in the prosecution of the war.

Under the changed conditions of the present, when we have cheapness and rapidity of land transportation, it is possible for a belligerent to buy all his food supplies and articles of a conditionally contraband nature in the open market of a neighboring country. His adversary, under the recognized rules of contraband, is left with no legal means of interrupting the transportation of these articles conditionally contraband when destined *bona-fide* to merchants in the neutral country. These latter may either manufacture therefrom or sell them at once in the open market, when agents of the belligerent may buy them. Furthermore, we must remember that the great complexity of belligerent needs of to-day and the specialization of the mechanism of armament now make certain articles which are also generally useful for the purpose of peace as necessary to supply the requirements of war as gunpowder itself. Highly civilized states, relying upon the coördination of inventive genius, are now able to do without the importation of absolute contraband, since they can manufacture their own equipment, provided always they have access to supplies of the ordinary raw materials in their own or adjacent neutral territory.

The result of this situation is to impair the value of the old system of contraband, since the belligerent in command of the seas can no longer make use of his naval supremacy seriously to harass his enemy either by means of blockade or by the seizure of contraband trade. Because of this situation, in the present war, Great Britain, before she can derive any great advantage from seizures of cargoes under the application of the legally recognized rules which permit interference with commerce, must coerce Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark by offering them the alternative of siding with her or against her. Great Britain could then apply blockade, or an extensive system of seizure for carriage of contraband. Unwilling to take such a course, she has adopted a half-way measure in the "interdict" of trade imposed upon neutral countries. She allows some trade with these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neutral countries bordering on Germany, but lets it be clearly understood that she will not permit them to serve as a base for supplying Germany.

As has been said above, England, finding contraband inadequate for her purposes, has had recourse to her might, and established a new interference with neutral commerce. Extraordinary conditions during the Revolutionary Wars offer some analogy to the present situation, and it may be that Great Britain's arbitrary action is laying the foundation for a new institution. The nations may well ask themselves whether it is not time to organize in an attempt to do away with the seizure not only of contraband, but of all private property as well. The trend of civilization towards specialization seems to warrant the hope that in the future wars may be more and more closely restricted to contests between highly specialized armaments. It would be a great gain to humanity if, when two nations fought, the whole war could be limited to such military operations without disturbing non-combatants and peaceful commerce.

III.

It is natural, when we consider the practical effects of the system of presumptions just described, that naval Powers waging war should, as we have pointed out, attempt to discard them and adopt others better suited to their belligerent purposes. In this respect England's situation is similar to that of Germany, who is hampered by the law of nations adopted before the advent of the submarine, which requires her to warn vessels. Germany's efforts to modify the recognized rules to suit the new invention and the attempts of Great Britain to deform the law of contraband are entirely illegal and contrary to the basic principles of international law.* They should be vigorously resisted by neutrals, not only to protect their own immediate material interests, but also to shield belligerents from the consequences of their own assaults upon the law of neutrality. In due course, positions may be reversed, and if belligerents are now allowed to pull down the laboriously erected structure of neutrality, they will later find themselves without a shield against the arrogant pretensions of belligerents. One of the lessons the present war should teach is the need of a law of contraband so clearly defined and so simple of comprehension that any attempt on the part of a belligerent to disregard it will be sure to arouse the anger and resistance of every neutral.

An important constructive proposal in regard to contraband is that brought forward by Professor Moore at the meeting of the Second National Foreign Trade Convention, held at St. Louis, January 12, 1915. After a lucid discussion of the whole problem of war and commerce and the need of some rational solution, he said:

Such a solution must, in my opinion, be sought, if not in the abolition of the principle of contraband, at any rate in the adoption of a plan embracing (1) the abolition of "conditional contraband," and (2) a single list having been agreed upon, in the coöperation of neutrals and belligerents in the certification of the contents of cargoes, so that the risk of capture may be openly borne by those who may voluntarily assume it, and harassing "searches" and detentions no more heard of.

Until the adoption of some such reform has been effected, the American Government will have reluctantly to put off the urging of its traditional doctrine to obtain the recognition of the immunity of private property at sea. The recognition of the inviolability of private property at sea, much as it is to be desired in the interest of all civilization, would prove a snare for well-intentioned Powers so long as the present anarchy concerning the régime of contraband is permitted to continue. Some new distortion of the law of contraband would be employed to reach all enemy property afloat.

If Great Britain would justify her seizures on the ground of reprisal, she should remember that there is a law of reprisals, although such measures are themselves extraordinary and their regulation extra-legal (but not illegal). The law of reprisals was violated when Great Britain retaliated her grievance against Germany at the expense of citizens of the United States, who have not injured her. The effect of reprisal ought to be limited to those who may be considered to share directly or indirectly in the responsibility for the commission of the act complained of.

At first sight and from a formal point of view, Germany stands on firmer ground with respect to the measures of retaliation she has employed against Great Britain's "interdict" upon neutral trade. Germany would argue that, since we have failed to do what we reasonably could to compel Great Britain to respect our rights of neutral commerce, we owe her a like complaisance in the form of a refusal to protect Americans travelling on vessels of the Allies within the reprisal area or zone which Germany has described about the British Isles.

The trouble lies not so much with Germany's logic as with her failure to remember that no civilized people not dominated by the passions of war would consider the interruption of American neutral commerce with Germany on the same plane as the sinking of American men, women, and children on the Lusitania. When Germany restricted the exportation of her dyes to relieve our starving industries, she was employing a reasonable and proper direct reprisal against us. If, as a result of her situation, Germany has no adequate humane means of retaliation at her command, the United States cannot be expected to permit her to practice inhumane measures upon American citizens. Between first-class Powers, any such attempt is tantamount to a veritable act of war.

I do not hesitate to recognize that, because of our failure to make our rights respected, our Government is really in part responsible for the suffering of Germany's civilian population; but Germany should understand that our complaisance towards the Allies is fundamentally in the nature of a retaliation against Germany for her violation of innocent Belgium's territory. Instead of sinking the Lusitania, Germany would have done better to try to eradicate the lamentable impression caused in this country by her froward disregard of the law of nations. The American nation is not necessarily pro-English, but the American people do stand for law and international security against a surprise attack. Hence the correct path for us to follow is either that of war or of loyal neutrality.

Much as I condemn and deplore Great Britain's violations of the rights of neutral commerce and the misery which our unexplained submission to these violations entails upon the peaceful inhabitants of Germany, I must recognize that there is a certain poetic justice in the whole situation. For at The Hague in 1907, when Great Britain squarely and fairly proposed to abolish contraband entirely—she was probably considering the future interference with her neutral trade which the application of the

*During the present war neutral rights have been violated in the following ways in addition to Germany's submarine transgressions:

(1.) Arbitrary and unreasonable extension of the lists of articles classed as in the nature of contraband.

(2.) Unjustifiable requisitions or preëmptions of cargoes.

(3.) The adoption of the presumptions of the London Declaration (Article 34) facilitating the condemnation of articles conditionally contraband, without observing the other articles which were a *quid pro quo* for this great extension of belligerent rights, namely, Article 35, abolishing the doctrine of continuous voyage in regard to conditional contraband, and Article 28, establishing a free list of articles like cotton, wool, etc., which might never be considered contraband.

(4.) The invention of a new presumption to the effect that goods, when in excess of the normal imports to certain neutral countries, may be considered as destined to the enemy's territory.

(5.) The invention of another presumption—necessary as a link in this chain of presumptions calculated to engulf legitimate neutral commerce—namely, that all goods bound to Germany may, under existing conditions in Germany, be considered as destined to the German military forces.

The effect of these two extraordinary presumptions is to replace the old proof based upon reasonable presumptions of hostile military destination by unreasonable presumptions—"pretensions" rather—of belligerent consumption, to which the further forced "pretension" is added, that consumption by the civil population of a belligerent territory is equivalent to military consumption—as pretty a piece of sophistry as may be found.

Great Britain, ruling over the seas, has forged from these new presumptions the prongs of her new trident, emblematic of her absolute dictation.

(6.) Exaction in regard to the *bona-fide* transfer of ships to a neutral flag.

(7.) Seizure of enemy property under the neutral flag in violation of the Declaration of Paris.

(8.) Unreasonable and illegal detention of vessels in Allied ports.

(9.) Delays in adjusting admitted violations of neutral rights.

(10.) Detention and examination of mails bound to and from neutral countries.

(11.) Arrest of passengers on neutral vessels.

The above are by no means all of the illegal and unjustifiable interferences with neutral commerce to which neutrals have been subjected.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present system might cause—Germany and the United States refused to acquiesce, although the strenuous opposition of the American naval delegate was later overborne by the instructions of his Government to support the British proposal to the extent of abolishing conditional contraband. When Great Britain, supported by a great majority of the countries represented at The Hague, was preparing to embody her proposal in the provisions of a separate treaty distinct from the Hague Conventions, it was Germany who prevailed upon her to abandon the attempt. And now Germany's citizens and American trade pay the penalty of that short-sighted policy.

Even if Great Britain should now agree to arbitrate her differences with us, it should be understood that the lengthy procedure of arbitration is no adequate redress for flagrant and continuing violations of right.

Correspondence

IN DEFENCE OF THE COLONEL.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I wish to say a word about your vicious and unjust editorial on Col. Roosevelt in this week's *Nation*.

It is easy to sit back in one's chair and analyze. It is altogether another matter to roll up one's sleeves, get into the dirt, and fight aggressively and constructively to better wrong and avert danger. When you, the side-line spectator, sneer at the efforts and the fighting of the men in the field, the meanness of your position is accentuated.

The smallness of "personal venom" could be no more clearly shown than by the tone of your editorial. Your implications in regard to Mr. Roosevelt's motives are uttered in so spiteful and sneering a way they need no answer.

This I wish to say, however, in protest to the burden of your article. Instead of the satire with which your opening words are written (. . . "It is of much consequence what happens to you [Roosevelt] and others of your generation who have been speaking like you. It is of much consequence to the very young men." . . .) the profoundest significance and truth is given those very words of yours to-day by thousands of young men in this country.

Mr. Roosevelt, and he himself will be the first to admit it, makes mistakes. He would be neither human nor great if he did not. It is the man who goes into the fight and makes honest mistakes that the young men are going to look to, and not the sneering side-line critic.

I belong to a militia organization. When the question comes up about the possibility of our being sent to Mexico, the feeling is strong that if Roosevelt were President we should go with far more satisfaction than under the present Administration. That is significant and typical of the attitude of the young men. We don't necessarily want war with Germany or intervention with Mexico; what we do want and what we are not getting is active, effective leadership in preparing this country for eventualities, which may very conceivably happen in the present state of world affairs. I believe it is true that old men as well as young have more faith in this "old man of fierce hatreds and clawing ambitions" than in the present incumbent of the White House.

Certainly what shall the young men do when they see the old men—as reflected by the *Nation*—attack a force for effective and righteous citizenship, such as many of us believe Mr. Roosevelt to be, in the spirit of your editorial? Copley Amory, Jr.

New York, April 28.

HENRY FORD IN MICHIGAN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your issue of April 20 you suggest that the "staggering vote for Henry Ford in Michigan" indicates the attitude of the people of this State upon questions of foreign and military policy. Permit me to say that you overlook some elements in the situation. The people of this country do not as a usual thing pay more regard to policies than to personalities; but contrariwise. In the case of the election in question, there was, previous to the election, practically no discussion of the policies of the candidates—certainly no clear issue of policies was framed. The preëlection comment was chiefly in the way of Homeric laughter at the absurdity of the choice of Presidential candidates which was put before us, and few could have thought that the policies of the candidates really mattered. Nor was there any real issue as to the relative fitness of the candidates for the Presidency, for no one supposed that any of the entrants could by any possibility become the candidate of the party of election. So idle did the election appear that many who went to the polls to vote on other questions declined to vote the Presidential ballot at all. The issue, then, was one of personalities, in the smallest sense of the term—it was a question as to who should receive the expensive bouquet of local nomination. What, then, were the personalities? Henry Ford, while regarded by the judicious as entirely unfitted for the Presidency, is a man of a type which is dear to our national heart, and he is more widely known than any other man in this country, save two or three. William Alden Smith, the only other candidate who was known outside of his own back yard, has long been a humiliation to most of the people of this State, and many welcomed the opportunity of expressing their attitude towards him. That, I believe, is the whole story of the vote in Michigan. It is certainly the interpretation which is current in this State.

Edgar N. Durfee.

Ann Arbor, Mich., April 24.

"A LIBERAL EDUCATION."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Mr. Gustav Pollak's article entitled "A Liberal Education," in your issue of April 13, raises an interesting question to which college faculties have as yet given too little attention: that, namely, of the relative importance of the several subjects which make up the required part of the curriculum. With all the overhauling to which college curricula are incessantly subjected in other respects, it is still the general practice to fix, as the unit of value, either the year or the term, and to require every subject which the student takes up to be followed for a prescribed number of hours, usually three or four per week, throughout that period. From the standpoint of administration and rating such a plan has indisputable advantages, not to speak of its usefulness in controlling the departmental ambitions and jealousies which sometimes show themselves. Whether such a Procrustean arrangement is best for the student, or embodies an altogether sound view of educational values, is, however, I think, at least open to question.

With the exception of modern languages (including English), the history and government of one's own country, and an elementary acquaintance with the laws of right thinking and of scientific method, it would not be easy to show that the subjects which, directly or indirectly, commonly form the requirements for a bachelor's degree are equally indispensable to the proper education of every undergraduate. Not every student can be interested in, or will ever much profit by, extended or detailed courses in literature, or philosophy, or ancient or mediæval history, or a particular branch of science. On the other hand, the conditions of modern life require of the cultivated person a measure of acquaintance with a considerable range of subjects—an equipment of what some one has called "intellectual small change." Would it be an unworthy thing for the college to furnish such equipment, in addition to its more thorough training in fundamentals? Why, for example, should the student who, in this year of reminiscent grace, would really like to know a little something about Shakespeare, be compelled, if he would slake his thirst, to "take a course" of three hours a week for a semester or a year, or else rely upon unaided private reading or an occasional public lecture? For precisely what educational reason should the undergraduate who sincerely desires some acquaintance with physics or biology, but who has no intention of becoming a physicist, an electrical engineer, a teacher of biology, or a doctor, commonly find the path closed to him unless he is prepared to use trigonometry or the calculus, or to take an extended course in the dissection of the cat?

Mr. Pollak's suggestion of meeting the difficulty in these directions, while at the same time enlarging the intellectual horizon of the student in many other directions also, is worthy, I venture to think, of serious consideration. May I point out, as a contribution to the discussion, two obstacles which would have to be overcome? The first is the problem of finding suitable lecturers. Every faculty is pretty certain to number among its members some good lecturers: men who know how to combine substance with attractive form, who are good speakers, and who can hold the attention and stir the interest of that most exacting of all audiences, a body of undergraduates. Not every department in the college, however, as a rule has such a member; and the contrast between good lecturers and poor ones, if such contrast arose, would be very likely to prejudice student opinion regarding those departments which were least well represented. On the other hand, such prejudice might not be any greater than that which often exists under prevailing methods of instruction; and, in any case, the attention which an obvious disparity would evoke could hardly fail to have a beneficial effect upon the quality of teaching as a whole.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The other obstacle concerns the method of testing the results of such lecture courses as Mr. Pollak suggests. So long as the attitude of the average student towards college work in general is what it is, tests of some kind can hardly be dispensed with if a modicum of interest and attention is to be obtained. I am not clear that Mr. Pollak's scheme of an examination by the whole body of lecturers would be practicable. The procedure could hardly avoid being formal, if not cumbersome, and it would certainly be very time-consuming. Yet one may fairly question whether the method of written examination which now generally obtains in colleges is, when taken as the sole form of test, either educationally wise or practically efficient; and whether some modification under which students should be dealt with individually, by word of mouth, ought not to be worked out. It would be, in this respect, a happy outcome if the discussion of Mr. Pollak's interesting proposal should contribute to the educational resource of faculties as well as to the intellectual orientation of students.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

Brown University, April 27.

THE SACHS RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Through the generosity of Mr. Samuel Sachs, of New York, there has recently been established in Harvard University the Sachs research fellowship in fine arts, with an annual income of $2,000. According to the terms of the foundation, this fellowship is to be awarded to "scholars of proved ability, whether students, instructors, or others, for the purpose of enabling them to pursue in any part of the world advanced studies in the history, principles, or methods of the fine arts. It is open to any American, man or woman. It is to be awarded (on the basis of evidence submitted by the applicants) by the Corporation, on the recommendation of a committee consisting of the president of Harvard University, the president of Radcliffe College, the directors of the Fogg Museum, the chairman of the Division of Fine Arts of Harvard University, and such other members of that division as these five may select."

As a practical means of informing those who are most likely to be interested in such a fellowship, we have sent to teachers of the fine arts in colleges and universities throughout the country a statement that "applications, accompanied in each case by evidence of the applicant's qualifications and the proposed plan of work, should be sent to Mr. George W. Robinson, secretary of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University Hall, Cambridge, Mass., before May 15, 1916, and that the award will be announced in June, 1916." Undoubtedly, there are many whom we have failed to reach, and this is my reason for asking the help of the *Nation* in giving wider publicity to this unusual opportunity for students of the fine arts.

In the letter of the donor to the Corporation of Harvard University, the purpose of the fellowship is stated as follows:

It is my hope that this fellowship may be used, as many fellowships in Oxford and Cambridge are used, to encourage original research and productive scholarship; that through such encouragement it may attract to Harvard University and to Radcliffe College and to the study of fine arts young men and women of promise, and may thus contribute to the development of competent teachers and critics, and directors and curators of museums. I should hope that it might occasionally be awarded to teachers, on sabbatical leave of absence, for special study abroad. It seems to me fitting that such a fellowship should be administered by the American university which was the first to introduce teaching in the fine arts and to maintain high standards of scholarship.

If fuller information in regard to the conditions of the fellowship is desired, it may be obtained from Mr. Robinson, or from me.

GEORGE H. CHASE.
Chairman of the Division of Fine Arts.

Cambridge, Mass., April 27.

Literature

THE WORDS OF THE PREACHER.

Fear God and Take Your Own Part. By Theodore Roosevelt. New York: George H. Doran Co. $1.50 net.

In this volume Mr. Roosevelt comes before us as the fighting parson, with the Bible in one hand and a sword in the other and the Battle Hymn of the Republic on his lips. He speaks brave words, too, warning that no one should follow him who has not in his "mood something of the heroic." And yet every one must follow him who has the interest of his country at heart, for: "I am standing for the larger Americanism, for true Americanism; and as regards my attitude in this matter, I do not ask as a favor, but challenge as a right, the support of all good citizens, no matter where born, and no matter of what creed or national origin."

The "larger Americanism" represented by Mr. Roosevelt demands of all good citizens support of the following policies: (1) To insult, taunt, and execrate the President of the United States and the Democratic party for all their words and acts; (2) to denounce "professional pacifists," whate'er their name or sign, as worshippers of Baal and active agents of the devil; (3) to avenge the violation of Belgium, and to protect the small countries of Europe and Asia; (4) to assert the Monroe Doctrine against the world; (5) to administer the affairs of Mexico, and exercise a kind of overlordship upon all countries north of the equator; (6) to build a fleet second only to that of Great Britain; (7) to maintain a regular army of a quarter of a million men; (8) to institute universal military service as a measure of preparedness for war and as a moral and social discipline; (9) to make such a hullabaloo over the army and navy and foreign policy that all good citizens will forget the assaults made on the courts and the Constitution in 1912, and that the sulphurous rifts which yawned between the Champion of the Plain People and the Republican bosses will be sunk 'neath a silence pure and smooth, like burnt out craters, etc.

Considered as a specimen of the art of vituperation, the series of harangues in which these policies are set forth leaves little to be desired. When one has sufficiently marvelled at the artist's inexhaustible powers of abuse, one falls into fresh amazement at the dauntless courage of his inconsistencies and his apparently boundless faith in the large, easy swallow of the Plain People. No man in public life has more bitterly denounced the corruption of public opinion by deliberate misrepresentation of the characters and motives of men in high office. Mr. Roosevelt waited till the seditious hyphenated-American press had vented its venom on the President; and then, dipping his pen in his capacious ink-pot, the native-born master of slander showed the alien amateurs how the job should be done. In the cold-blooded way of misrepresentation nothing could be more finished than his now "classic" explanation of Mr. Wilson's motives for interfering in Mexico: "He never did it, however, to secure justice for Americans or other foreigners. He never did it to secure the triumph of justice and peace among the Mexicans themselves. He merely did it in the interest of some bandit chief whom at the moment he liked, in order to harm some other bandit chief whom at the moment he disliked." (Hyphenated American press please copy.)

In his capacity as theologian Mr. Roosevelt has frequently preached a sermon on the duty of forgiving and forgetting the offences of those who have repented of their evil ways. One can readily understand how that doctrine commends itself to a man with his power of putting off the old man and putting on the new. For something over a year now, he has stood with hands uplifted in the synagogue, thanking God—just a bit vociferously perhaps—that in the hour of Belgium's calamity he was not as these mollycoddles, and prattlers of pretty phrases, and these Byzantine logothetes are; but that he stood then, as ever, for the "valor of righteousness." Alas, that our dead selves, by which we would rise as on stepping-stones to higher things, should prove a stumbling block in the path of the just. For mark you, now; some rancorous and malevolent journalist, with no milk of forgiveness or forgetfulness in him, has raked out of the cubbyholes of oblivion an old copy of the *Outlook*, issue of September 23, 1914, in which the fighting parson declares that "we have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen" Belgium, and that "it is certainly eminently desirable that we should remain entirely neutral, and nothing but urgent need would warrant breaking our neutrality and taking sides one way or the other." And this pedantic delver in the dead past, this pestiferous "resurrection man," raises the question with what decency the writer of those words can charge the President with prattling with "unctuous self-righteousness about 'the duty of neutrality.'"

A gentleman who holds a sword or a six-shooter in one hand no doubt has some difficulty in turning over the leaves of the Bible, which he holds in the other, especially if at the same time the full energy of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his soul is thrown into singing the Battle Hymn of the Republic. So far as the tribal Jehovah of the Old Testament is concerned, Mr. Roosevelt, of course, does not need to refer to his text. In the New Testament he is not quite so much at home, and his exegetical effort falls a little short of coherence. Having in mind, perhaps, a time-honored utterance on the devil's facility in quoting Scripture, he warns us that the pacifist plea based upon the spirit and teaching of Jesus is "an instance of the adroit casuistry that can twist isolated teachings of the Gospels in any required direction." In the same breath he tells us that "the duty of preparedness has rarely been put in stronger form than by St. Luke." In the next breath he declares that "as a matter of fact, the Gospels do not deal with war at all." A little later he announces that the friendlessness of the United States is due to our having shown the "'neutrality' of the Levite," presumably with relation to Belgium, while the Allies were playing the good Samaritan. As we recall the text, the goodness of the Samaritan was manifested by binding up the wounds and providing food and lodging for the victim. Mr. Roosevelt's analogy would have been rather more pertinent if the man from Samaria had left the victim of the robbers weltering in his gore, and, lifting his voice in protest, had gone galloping, with or without a sword, hot foot after the robbers.

But Mr. Roosevelt is not a thinker, not a logician; he is a man of feeling. Only malevolent and unpatriotic readers will subject to academic scrutiny the logical underpinning of his platform. He is very fond, for example, of drawing parallels between personal and national wrongs, and between the exercise of the police power and the use of military force in war. All pacifists that are not liars or fools, if there be any that are neither, "must announce," says the Colonel, "that the same principle which makes them denounce a just war entered into for the sake of the welfare of the nation as a whole, also makes them denounce the man who, by force, endeavors to protect his daughter against infamy, or the woman who opposes her feeble strength to the brutality of the kidnapper of her child." To this, some pacifist, wriggling in the unspeakable baseness and loathsomeness of his logical consistency, might retaliate: "All bellifists that are not fools or liars must announce that the same principle which justifies avenging by military force upon three or four generations of innocent men, women, and children the wrongs perpetrated by a wicked government, justifies also the police in turning Gatling guns upon the crowd at a fair into which a pickpocket has escaped, and justifies also the private citizen in wiping out all the relatives and burning all the dwellings of the relatives of the man who has slapped his wife's face."

Mr. Roosevelt obviously feels just a shade of embarrassment in explaining to his countrymen why he is in favor of universal military service. What he would like to say apparently is that he envies Germany her perfectly "bully" army. What he actually says is that universal military service would give us the "efficiency of spiritual and moral patriotism" which "would make us able to parallel the extraordinary German achievements." And again: "If we value the heritage bequeathed to us by Washington and saved for us by Lincoln, we will at once begin the effort to emulate the German efficiency." In the present state of popularity enjoyed in this country, however, by the German military organization, it would not quite do to ask countrymen of Washington and Lincoln to begin at once the effort to emulate the German army. No; the military organization which we are to imitate is that of Switzerland. As Switzerland has a population about equal to that of New York city, and as Switzerland is a tiny inland republic surrounded by four great military powers, the situation of Switzerland is "of course," as the Colonel would say, precisely parallel to that of the United States; and any inferences relating to the effect of universal military service upon the spirit of the Swiss people will obviously be applicable to the American people. Now, the Swiss people with obligatory service are not militaristic; therefore it follows, as the night the day, that the American people, with obligatory service, would not be militaristic. At the beginning of our paragraph, as the pedantic reader will note, universal military service is to produce a moral and spiritual patriotism like Germany's. At the end of our paragraph it is only going to help us defend our neutrality, like Switzerland. What do ye lack, good people?

The points in the preacher's harangue at which cold shudders will course up and down the patriot's spine are those at which he reads us the "lessons" of the war in Europe. "We have utterly failed," he cries, "even with the lesson of the last year writ in blood and fire before our eyes, to take steps to protect ourselves from such horrors." The first "eternal principle" illustrated by the blood and fire of Europe is that preparedness for war prevents war; let any one who is in doubt on this point look at England, look at France, look at Russia, or if one thinks they were insufficiently prepared, look at Germany. A second "eternal principle" illustrated by this war is that "the attack is the proper method of defence"; again, good people, we ask you, though the Colonel hesitates to do so, to look at Germany. A third "eternal principle" proved by the events of the past year is that "all talk of preventing aggression from unscrupulous militaristic nations by arbitration treaties, Hague Conventions, peace agreements, and the like, represents nothing but empty declamation"; again look at Germany. The wriggling pacifist may possibly raise his contemptible voice to inquire whether the opposition offered to the aggressions of Germany was merely that of "international public opinion"—whether the Triple Entente, for example, was quite "unbacked by force"; but what of that? If the united military and naval forces of Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Japan, etc., are held at bay by the one Power which has efficiently performed its national duty, the conclusion is inevitable that we shall have once more to invite you to look at—Switzerland! Yes, surely, it is writ in blood and fire before the eyes of the United States that we should look at Switzerland.

Still another lesson of the great war and of the years before the war which the Preacher has not yet got around to delivering is that one of the great forces that prevent war is a conception on the part of the leader of a nation that he is God's anointed, and a conception on the part of his followers that they are God's chosen people. When the other nations of the world perceive those conceptions taking definite shape in the speech and action and policy of any one of the family of nations, they quickly catch the hint, and accept their inferior place in the world order. And if a "proud and high-spirited" nation like Germany, for example, determines to have the strongest army in the world, France exclaims at once: "Why, let her have it! What's that to me?" And if a "proud and high-spirited" nation like Great Britain determines to have the strongest navy in the world, Germany murmurs, "Agreed! Why not?" "We are the citizens," says the Preacher in his most moving accents, "of a mighty Republic consecrated to the service of God above, through the service of man on the earth." Jehovah is our Lord; come let us fight his battles. In order to fight them efficiently, we shall have to have a navy modelled on Great Britain's, and an army modelled on Switzerland's, and we shall have to imitate the "moral and spiritual patriotism" of Germany; but, happily, the family of nations, seeing our purpose, will drop at once out of competition with us, and within a few years we shall be in a position to show the "valor of righteousness" to Japan and Germany, and to all the great nations that lie between us and the Panama Canal. Or if, through any unforeseen flash of jealousy or suspicion on the part of the other nations, they should refuse to acquiesce, and should themselves institute universal military service, and go in for a big naval programme, why, then, as the present war teaches us, nothing is more speedily and painlessly settled than a conflict among "nations in arms"; and when entire nations are in arms, victory always falls to the nation which fears God.

In short, to the philosophic observer nothing is so plainly demonstrated by the European conflict as that the old ways are best. The remedy for military expenditure is more military expenditure; the remedy for war is more war. The larger Americanism demands a share in the wars to come. Adequate preparedness for them will necessitate enormous sacrifices. But the past year has shown us that all peoples will sacrifice

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time and wealth and life for war. The valor of righteousness and the valor of unrighteousness are as cheap and as common as dirt. The only sacrifices which no proud high-spirited people will make are the sacrifices which are the cost of peace. For a peace that demands patience and self-control and rational arbitrament of disputes is a vexation to the flesh of virile and strenuous men. We are for peace, to be sure; but only so long as we may enjoy unchecked the sway of our national will. The red blood of twenty millions of Teutons courses in our veins; and, despite our present lethargy, when the appointed hour comes to realize our "legitimate aspirations," we, too, shall invoke our good old-fashioned tribal Jehovah, and draw our six-shooters. So much for the "progressive" outlook in 1916.

SOME TALES OF SENSIBILITY.

Just David. By Eleanor H. Porter. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

The Unpretenders. By Anne Warwick. New York: John Lane Co.

The Vindication. By Harriet Comstock. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.

A Daughter of the Revolution. By Esther Singleton. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co.

Drifting Waters. By Rachel Swete Macnamara. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Side of the Angels. By Basil King. New York: Harper & Brothers.

If, from year to year, anything is made clear by publishers' lists, and ratings of "best-sellers," it is that there is a very large public which wants not the novel of true realism or the novel of pure romance, but the novel of sensibility. It does not ask for interpretation, it does not ask for a noble illusion: it merely asks for the loan of a handkerchief and a bit of onion in its eye. This is putting the thing crudely, but the thing is crude.

Here, for example, is a story called "Just David," by a writer who may be accepted as an expert in this field. That is, she has written a number of stories which have been hailed with enthusiasm as nice and sweet and pretty and "glad," by many a weary housewife—as potent an arbiter of taste as the tired business man himself. This writer purveys the kind of sentiment which is warranted to induce a good cry, or a good laugh, without charge upon the intelligence of her readers. The David of her latest figment is a quite impossible urchin who becomes a quite impossible man of genius, and chiefly distinguishes himself by the exercise and enunciation of a singularly unoriginal, not to say priggish, philosophy. He poses, he prates, he sets his elders right at every turn, he oozes moral honey at every pore. He is the hero of a narrative which bears rather less resemblance to a piece of sound creative fiction than a Salvation Army concert bears to a cathedral service. The action is utterly flimsy, the persons who are supposed to hover about David, admiring him, are built of sticks and pumpkins and wisps of straw. And thousands of readers will probably welcome it—here is the kind of story to read—this is the kind of thing we like—so sweet, so wholesome!

Every man to his "dope," as the proverb says—and every man to his patter about "medicinal purposes." Not much of our fiction of sensibility, after all, frankly offers itself as a sedative. The prime illusion of the sentimentalist is that he is an idealist. He pampers himself in the whole-hearted belief that he is subserving some great end towards which, somewhat in his rear, the whole creation moves. There is probably little harm in our sobbing on each other's bosoms now and then, but the habit could not be cultivated as ennobling. The famous psychologist who argued that an occasional spree may be good for a man was not recommending the gutter as an abode.

In "The Unpretenders" of Anne Warwick, sensibility assumes its sprightlier garb. Brightness or "cuteness" is the keynote of these sketches, which tend to prove how human, in spite of appearances, most of us probably are. They smartly sentimentalize a wide range of types: a writer, a plain woman, a maid-servant, a society person, a wag, a clubman, a philanthropist, a king, a mere wife, an idler. These remain types, effectively made up and costumed to suggest individuals, but speaking by the card, and with the accent of their contriver. They are all posed, self-conscious, and "smarty"; conceived in that spirit of sentimental facetiousness which passes for humor with a surprisingly large number of people, of whatever sex.

"The Vindication" has a sort of idea behind it, but its method and machinery are sentimental. Two children, a boy and a girl, are changed in the cradle. The boy is of honorable parentage, the girl is the illegitimate offspring of a brutal inn-keeper and his drudge. Matters are for a long time supposed to be the other way about. The thing that is vindicated in the end is the theory of the benevolent physician of the piece that environment is a far more potent influence than heredity. But the emotions of the benevolent physician and his charges are really of much more importance to these pages than any idea, or action, or characterization. The boy and the girl, of course, love each other, and are permitted to discover the fact after a suitable intervention of obstacles, real or imagined. We leave them in each other's arms, being blessed by the benevolent Dr. Hill. They have been talking about what a great fellow he is:

"A long, thin hand crept from the coverings and fell upon the warm, clasped ones near by. A voice, shaken by the most sacred emotions Manton Hill had ever known, said:

"'My boy!' Then in the throbbing stillness: 'Forgive me—I have not been asleep.'

"Chet bent his head and clung to the hand that had never failed him; Lorraine went behind the long, low chair, and, leaning over, pressed her happy lips to the frosted line where youth and age met."

Whatever mild shadow of an idea may be present in "A Daughter of the Revolution" appears to be connected with a belief in heredity. The Mildred Ashton of the story is represented as strikingly like a certain Revolutionary ancestress, not only in looks, but in character and destiny. But it is plain that what this sets out to be is a pretty story, and the people in it and the things they do are merely accessory to that amiable intention. Mildred loses her ancestral acres on Long Island and goes to New York to make her fortune. The people at her boarding-house are liberally set forth, and the brief experience of struggle which precedes Mildred's triumphal entry into the arena of letters. She and we are introduced into fashionable circles and to scenes of luxury, with a moral. Thus we attend a ball at the Plaza, only to be admonished:

To a casual observer looking down from a height upon a midnight supper in one of the big New York hotels and noting the vast crowd of beautifully dressed women, sparkling with jewels and wafting in the tropical warmth the choicest and most delicate perfumes at every turn of their heads, bodies, and gloved hands; at the well-dressed and well-groomed men, seated at the hundreds of little tables, around which the waiters thread their way so marvellously to bring tempting and beautifully decorated dishes; at the exhibition dancers; at the lights; and at the flowers; and hearing the popping of champagne corks; the clatter of voices with laughter occasionally cutting through the din; and the intoxicating syncopated rhythms of the insidious music, he would imagine that nothing but joy and happiness reigned in the heart and breast of every one present, apparently taking life so lightly, so gayly, so carelessly.

Far from it!

Even Mildred, "in her canary silk with her rich topaz ornament," is far from as happy as she looks. She is, indeed, on the verge of a serious affair with a married Jack. But she keeps to her resolution to be "a true daughter of her house and race," and her reward is a very different kind of man from the married Jack.

The situation of the young pair who are, for one far-fetched reason or another, married only in name, seems to possess an inexhaustible piquancy. There is scarcely another of equal appeal, unless it be that of the young unmarried pair isolated on a mountain top or a desert island. The married-in-name wife, to be sure, cannot be "compromised," but that only increases the burden of chivalry which is laid upon the shoulders of the man. In "Drifting Waters," this ancient dish is warmed over, not very palatably. Anne's mother does not like Ricky, and Ricky himself has to admit that he cannot support Anne. He will, therefore, go to Australia and make his fortune. But he must call Anne his own first; so they are married at a Registry Office just

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before Ricky sails. After a long stay in Australia, he goes to Egypt instead of coming home, and Anne decides that he does not love her, and suggests that it may be as well to have the marriage annulled. This is a shock to Ricky, and he at once summons Anne to his side. After that, the only thing that really keeps them apart is the determination of their author. "Had they been playing at some idiotic game of cross-purposes all these weary weeks?" Ricky asks himself when Anne has actually left him and started for England. "Could she possibly have made the same mistake about him as he had about her? Were ever two people so utterly imbecile? So impossibly blind?" Yes, there have been plenty of people like that, in print, at least. They have figured in two very recent stories, "Where the Path Breaks" and "Fulfilment." They are, indeed, among the standard *personæ* of sentimental fiction.

They play leading parts, once more, in "The Side of the Angels"; and no doubt the extraordinary popularity of the book is partly a tribute to them. It is a decidedly dull story, greatly labored towards a didactic end. The persons have a certain strained verisimilitude: they vaguely suggest reality, without ever quite achieving it. The trouble is, their author cannot let them alone, he must be using them for his own purposes, and dragging them through their prescribed tasks, for the greater glory. But many people like this kind of thing. Books of priggish sentimentality are always sure of a market. It is not Mr. King's story, or his persons, or even his central idea, which wins him so large a constituency: it is his emotionalism, and his skill in playing upon (intellectually) middle-class sensibilities. "The Inner Shrine" was not a very good story, "The Side of the Angels" is not; but they are excellent commodities; they are, in the phrase of the street, astonishingly "good dope." Whatever may be the uncertainties and the vicissitudes of true realism, of pure romance, there is always a fair hearing assured for the work of mere sensibility. Commercially speaking, the "Rosaries" which blossom upon the outskirts of the garden of letters will always be a better gamble than the solid fruits so sedulously tended within.

H. W. Boynton.

A STUDY OF THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA.

India and Its Faiths: A Traveller's Record. By James Bissett Pratt. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $4.50 net.

The experienced reviewer always shudders when he opens a new traveller's record of India. The platitudes of travel and panaceas for Hindu ills! He feels them coming upon him in advance and knows beforehand even the "original photographs" taken by the guileless author. It is a fresh and pleasing adventure to read the record of a traveller who has something important to say.

Professor Pratt had studied the ground before he went hunting. He was after big game, and he has returned with booty worth showing. In other words and without metaphor, his title is unconsciously misleading, for he has given us no traveller's record, as that phrase is generally used, but a careful and well-considered criticism of modern faiths in India, for the more intimate study of which he had carefully prepared himself. One after another he takes up the subjects of gods and God, duty and destiny, the various modern reform movements, such of the older sects as have appeared as reformations, the value of Buddhism and Christian missions. Not all is of equal value. The chapter on the Sikhs is rather negligible as new matter, while that on the Jains is imbued with first-hand and appreciative criticism, both favorable and adverse. This is one of the sects most difficult to understand from book-knowledge; for while it is correct to say that the Jains deny God, worship man, and nourish vermin, a companionable Jain priest soon shows one that their formal belief is not their religion at all. Here our author seems to waver in his impressions. In one passage he notes that in most of the ninety sects of Jains the emphasis is put on form to the sacrifice of spiritual life, and in another he records that Jainism makes its laity earnest men who exhibit stronger traits of resignation than other Indians and are willing to sacrifice anything for religion.

Professor Pratt is not afraid of religious parallels and queries whether a dip in the Ganges is not the same as a dip in Jordan to remove sin. He compares the unwillingness of the Hindu saint to do good to others with the Christian ideal, and is not obsessed by the idea that the former attitude is a mark of higher spirituality. He even ventures to believe that the obscene side of Hindu religion is "out of keeping with the Hindu character," because a Hindu told him so. He should have remembered the truer word of his own introduction, "one must not believe everything that one is told by the Indians in praise of their own religion." Occasionally a statement of fact is too general: "In India marriage has nothing to do with falling in love." How about India as depicted in its own literature? Modern India is probably meant; but even then the statement is exaggerated.

The survey of Christian work in India is excellent. The author admits that most of the converts are little better than savages and the dregs of society, some of whom become Christian as a speculation. But he argues that when Christianity first appeared it appealed most to the same class. He thinks also that conservative missionaries are making a mistake in teaching old-fashioned Christianity; they ought to go still farther back and teach the religion of Galilee instead of that of Geneva and Westminster. If they also permitted the Buddhists to have faith in Buddha as well as in Christ and the Mohammedans to call God Allah, it would do no harm. The main thing is not to preach theology, but the spirit of Christianity, whether called "Christian" or not. This will be a hard doctrine for the missionary boards, but it will be a joyful evangel to the Indians.

A HUMAN RHETORICIAN.

Principles of Composition. By Percy H. Boynton. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.

Books on English composition have not been few during the last twenty-five years, nor have they been monotonously alike in either purpose or excellence. Of those before 1900, Hill's, Genung's, and Wendell's, at least, continue to be preëminent. Wendell's "English Composition" (1893) was really not a textbook at all, but a volume of lectures, entirely free from "apparatus," which had the great merits of being readable and of analyzing structure—particularly coherence—more serviceably than any of its predecessors. Hill's "Principles of Rhetoric" (1878; revised, 1895), dealt more with "rhetoric" than with "English composition," but always with the utmost sanity and with the strictest care for form. Genung's "Working Principles of Rhetoric" (1901), a revision of his "Practical Elements of Rhetoric" (1886), dealt with both "rhetoric" and "English composition," and is, in spite of being rather voluminous and philosophical, the book to which we still go, over and over again, when we want a real explanation of something too casually treated elsewhere. All three of these books are admirably written; all three assume that the subject has interest and dignity; all three are conservative, if not fastidious, in their general temper, and happily unconscious of certain recent tendencies in the making of textbooks and in the teaching of English composition.

These tendencies have partly been brought about by the fact that English is now being taught to enormous numbers of students for whom it is by way of being a foreign language. English composition is, furthermore, sharing in the general movement towards "efficiency" which leads even the humanities to an anxious search for more points of contact with "life" and with the business of the day. In the case of English composition, this has meant a rather vague and noisy, though admirably well-intentioned, campaign in which much is said about "oral composition" and "service conditions," and in which the amount of doctrine that used to be thought necessary has been more and more reduced to make way for specimens, exercises, patent notebooks, and the like. The "four kinds of composition," and various crossbreedings of them, now receive chapters, if not entire volumes, to themselves; the claim of debating is generously recognized; the use of the college library receives attention; the merits of card catalogues and of loose-leaf notebooks are not unsung; and the perturbed spirit who does not know how to fold a letter in order to get it into an envelope may now find enlightenment and relief. Few of these tendencies, if any, are useless; few, if any, of the books which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embody them are wholly bad, though most of them are tiresomely and none too correctly written. But very few of these newer books succeed in quieting one's suspicion that their essential contribution to the subject could perfectly well—the consideration of royalties aside—have been embodied in a short article. In other regions of scholarship slight contributions are not ordinarily made excuses for new treatments of the entire field; they are made the occasion of short, substantial articles in learned journals. It is to be hoped that the recently founded *English Journal* may permit those who have enough material for an article, but not enough for a book, to enlighten their colleagues without unduly increasing the literature of an already over-written subject. We have far too many slight adaptations—with new illustrative matter and a shift of emphasis here and there—of a few earlier books.

Holding these general ideas about English composition, we approached Professor Boynton's new book with considerable doubt. The work, although brief, is generous in its scope. It gives 32 pages to good usage; 125 pages to the principles of structure in the sentence, the paragraph, and the whole composition; and 200 pages to the kinds of composition, including the letter. In spite of this, it contrives to include a sufficient number of illustrative quotations and of subjects for themes—all in 382 pages.

The greatest merit of the book seems to us to be its freedom from the conventional atmosphere and terminology of the textbook and the classroom. Professor Boynton actually writes like a human being. He is never priggish and never dull. There is not a chapter in his book which makes one feel that it was put in merely to round out the subject.* Its fresh and hearty tone has been secured because Professor Boynton is obviously a born teacher. Entirely practical, and phrased with the most delightful informality, his pages seem like the confidential advice of a good coach, whose pupil sits, not in a dreary classroom, but in a study with well-furnished shelves.

Yet the book constantly goes at the most fundamental aspects of its subject, and successfully safeguards its readers from assuming that the study of composition is a search for cleverness or for decoration. The first part—"What to Write About"—which is one of the best features of the book, is a case in point. For too many students, English composition begins with writing, not with thinking and the use of books. There has of late been a healthy reaction against this idea, with the result that many of the recent works have more or less advice about gathering and weighing material. Too often, however, this advice has concerned chiefly the mechanical details of note-taking and the use of catalogues and reference books. Professor Boynton goes beyond this, and, with admirable vigor and informality, puts in little more than twenty pages the essentials that need to be given at the threshold of the subject.

One wishes that the book had been written with a little more respect for the purist's notion of good usage. One regrets the frequency of such compounds as "composition work," "drill work," "literature work," "student work," "student theme," "sentence interest," and "sentence unity." One regrets "onto" (p. 169); one regrets "per page" (p. 69); one regrets that disapproval has not been shown (p. 281) towards the slangy use of "proposition" in one of Professor Boynton's "student themes." And, of course, one feels that in 386 pages all of these matters cannot be thoroughly developed.

The crucial test of such a work, however, is its power to make students write well; and, if we may judge by the bits of themes scattered through his book, Professor Boynton has met this test with notable success. Even though one cannot grant him the thoroughness or the distinction of form that characterize some of his predecessors, one is delighted to have made the acquaintance of so capable and human a teacher of English composition.

*The treatment of formal argument, which Professor Boynton apparently could not do with complete respect for that subject, has wisely been handed over to a colleague, with some highly important suggestions (page 274) about the possible danger of over-formalizing what ought to be a flexible and readable kind of writing.

Notes

"The Border Legion," by Zane Grey, is announced for publication on May 18 by Harper & Bros.

Ian Hay's "Carry On," a sequel to "The First Hundred Thousand," will be published shortly by Houghton Mifflin Co.

Bobbs-Merrill Co. announces the forthcoming publication of "The Door of Dread," by Arthur Stringer, and "Poems of War and Peace," by Robert Underwood Johnson.

"Germany in Defeat, Phase II," by Count de Souza, and an English translation of Hermann Fernau's "Because I Am a German," by T. W. Rolleston, are announced as forthcoming by E. P. Dutton & Co.

The publication of the Loeb Classical Library in America has been taken over by G. P. Putnam's Sons, who announce that the following volumes are in preparation for publication during 1916: Greek Authors—"Achilles Tatius," by S. Gaselee; "Daphnis and Chloe," by J. M. Edmonds; "Parthenias," by S. Gaselee; "Dio Cassius. Roman History," by E. Cary (nine volumes. Vols. IV and V); "Galen. On the Natural Faculties," by A. J. Brock; "Greek Anthology," by W. R. Paton; "Homer. The Odyssey," by A. T. Murray; "Marcus Aurelius," by C. R. Haines; "Plutarch. The Parallel Lives," by B. Perrin (ten volumes. Vols. III and IV); "Procopius," by H. B. Dewing (Vol. II); "Strabo," by Horace L. Jones (nine volumes. Vol. I); "Theophrastus. History of Plants," by Sir A. F. Hort (two volumes. Vol. I); "Xenophon. Hellenica and Anabasis," by C. L. Brownson (two volumes. Vol. I). Latin Authors—"Ovid. Metamorphoses," by F. J. Miller; "Plautus," by Paul Nixon (four volumes. Vol. I); "Seneca. Tragedies," by F. J. Miller (two volumes. Vol. I); "Seneca. Epistles," by R. M. Gummere (three volumes. Vol. I); "Virgil," by H. R. Fairclough (Vols. I and II).

The Putnams also announce the forthcoming publication of the following volumes: "The Hermit Doctor of Gaya," by I. A. R. Wylie; "The Tempest" (in the Granta Shakespeare), edited by J. H. Lobban; "The Allied Cook Book," arranged by Grace Clergue Harrison and Gertrude Clergue; "Who Goes There?" by the author of "Aunt Sarah and the War"; "People Who Run," by Violetta Thurston; "If Ye Fulfill the Royal Law," by A. H. W. As representative of the Cambridge University Press, this house announces the publication of the following: "Manuring for Higher Crop Production," by E. J. Russell; "Some Great Regions of the World" (Cambridge Geographical Readers); "The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel," in the Revised Version, with notes and introduction by the late A. B. Davidson, revised by the late A. W. Streane (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges); "Sevastopol," by Leo Tolstoy, edited by A. P. Goudy and E. Bullough; "The Integration of Functions of a Single Variable" (Number 2 of the Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics), by G. H. Hardy.

Thomas Burke leads the reader to expect a bookful of pastels in his "Nights in London" (Holt; $2.50 net) and happily disappoints him in this. There is some well-done impressionist description; but the mood is too casual to fit an arbitrary scheme, the author too cheerful to renounce the simpler pleasures of narrative. He likes best, perhaps, to write of the London of sailors in port, of Shadwell, Limehouse, the West India Docks, the Isle of Dogs, Blackwall, and sees there the sort of sights a Dickens might see. Hoxton and Kingsland Road, Whitechapel and Clerkenwell, wherever Londoners live or their foreign populations colonize, he finds himself at home, so it be not Kensington or Bayswater or some other district that "ridicule cannot kill." Music standing high in his interest, he has a nice taste in "halls" and bits of popular song, a commendable affection for street sounds and cries. But his great passion, he would apparently have the reader believe, is for quaint restaurants and characteristic food—a book, one would say, to pick up before supper and not too soon after dinner; yet for all that, a book for a time of well-fed content, when the reader is disposed to agree cordially with his author or cap his whirling talk with delighted contradiction. There is one oddity about this English adept in causerie. Though he dearly loves to shock his grandmother—charity is the most nauseous of virtues, good taste is a nauseating quality, he loathes good breeding, there is nothing more tedious than the Greek idea of beauty, and he has in contemplation a League for the Suppression of Social Service—yet he can be at the coyest pains to avoid shocking the reader. Evasion and omission, even to the point of the asterisk period, are to be found among his bag of tricks; especially when, as happens now and again, something is to be said and at the precise moment something to be left unsaid about the indiscretions of the unconventional feminine or occasionally the discretion of the disreputable. Add that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brisk and saucy pen runs readily with indignation against the "rude throng at war with beauty and with truth," and can turn a pretty verse, and we have here a generous flood of good talk on an inexhaustible theme.

"Walt Whitman as Man, Poet and Friend," by Charles N. Eliot (Boston: Richard C. Badger), awakens expectations by the title which the contents hardly fulfil. The editor, Mr. Norton, originally solicited anecdotes from friends and acquaintances of the poet. The anecdotes being rarely forthcoming, tributes or observations of any sort were invited instead. Of these the supply was abundant. We have in all forty letters and more presented in facsimile, and of very varying interest. Even Charles Dudley Warner's note declining to go on record because he had never seen Whitman is solemnly preserved. Typewritten missives are facsimiled. All this show of documentation rather emphasizes the slenderness of the contents. The reproach does not apply to Mr. Traubel's letter, which is of fair proportion. Carnegie, Edward Carpenter, Edward Dowden, Joachim Miller, Theodore Roosevelt, W. M. Rossetti, E. C. Stedman, and J. T. Trowbridge are among the contributors. The book is ruled in red, bound in buckram and soft leather, has a few pictures, and the edition so limited that only five hundred camerados may hope to acquire their copy.

"The World Decision," by Robert Herrick (Houghton Mifflin; $1.25), is one of the best war books that has come to our desk. Unlike its numerous kind, it is written with gravity, deliberation, and a concern for permanent values. The author witnessed the gradual progress of Italy towards clarity on the great issue. Then he passed to France and studied her Spartan regeneration. His laudation of the French spirit is all the more effective that it is concrete and measured. Towards England his attitude seems not quite generous. He does not fully grasp the extent of her unpreparedness, nor yet her boundless tolerance of dissent. Of German efficiency he is a frank admirer, though clearly perceiving its limitations. It ignores the most precious and humane values. His survey ends in America, where the confusion of counsels not unnaturally appalls him. "There are many voices in the air, too many. Americans have not yet found themselves in this crisis of world tragedy, and the Government at Washington has not helped them to an understanding." The general tendency of the book is comprised in the following:

> Latin patriotism is ardent like man's one great love for woman, ennobling the giver as well as the loved one; it is tender like the son's love for the mother, with the sanctity of acknowledgment of the debt of life. Can any vision of "internationalism" take the place of these powerful personal loyalties to racial ideals? . . . "These boys led to the slaughter" is the sentimentality one hears of the marching conscripts of European armies. Better even so than the curse of no supreme allegiance, or devotion, or readiness to sacrifice—than the aimless selfishness in which an American youth is brought up.

"The Germans in Belgium," by L. H. Grondys (Appleton; 50 cents net), is an important contribution to the psychology of conquest *more teutonico*. Dr Grondys, as a neutral professor in Flanders, had extraordinary opportunities for observation. He witnessed the sack of Louvain and was instrumental in convoying to safety a band of unfortunate colleagues from the stricken city. He finds that the German atrocities rested in part on the Teutonic "scientific" conception of warfare, but even more on the embarrassment and panic of the conquerors. In the armies that passed through Brussels he noticed the peculiar timidity of the rough soldiers in the face of a civilized population. Such civilization, generally considered, is perhaps not worth very much, but it implies well-being, the spirit of criticism, the incessant control of all gestures and movements, and at times merriment at the expense of others. All these Germans at Brussels made one think of the Roman legions passing through Athens, exposed to the smiles and witticisms of the population.

This spiritual ill ease was the fertile soil in which panic could grow. No rumor was too gross to be believed. They burned and slew out of fear. Professor Grondys heard the destruction of Louvain discussed by a German officer before the day of woe. In behalf of his friends he repeatedly braved the insolent barbarity of high commanders. In these dealings he showed an intrepid tact which he relates with modest objectivity. It is the most enlightening book on the German devastation of Belgium which has come to our hands.

Now that the experts are telling us that the war is nearing its close, we are turning a more critical eye upon the ubiquitous book of impressions from the front; for the average peaceful householder may now lay adequate claims to a working knowledge of the technical jargon and tangled ethic that have forced themselves into his neutral cosmos. Indeed, after the war, we are inclined to doubt the enormous output of war literature promised us by the literary pessimist: the flood is now in spate. There is technical evidence of some such appreciation of the task accomplished by the neutral American reader in Arthur Ruhl's "Antwerp to Gallipoli" (Scribner; $1.50). Not only has the author successfully crystallized his impressions of the various combatants, but, with a commendable artistry, he has respected the intelligence of his reader, and with deft strokes presented only the bare, necessary scene. To this admirable method he has frankly contributed, with a chary modesty, illuminating flashes of a personal reaction which is in marked contrast to the plethora of indiscriminate impressionism with which so many recent war books have been stuffed. For these reasons his book is welcome reading. Even for a practiced pen like Mr. Ruhl's the temptation must have been importunate in the face of the variety and interest of his experiences. Instead, he offers us the essential view from his various points of vantage: Antwerp, Berlin, Paris, Bordeaux, Budapest, Cracow, and Gallipoli, to say nothing of interesting snap shots of Rumania and Bulgaria. All the cities are seen at the high tides of invasion or retreat, and in each case we are shown the spirit of their peoples reflected in the perverted *genius loci*, where vestiges of a national or human solidarity elbowed impatiently the strange, intolerable conditions of war. Most of these places in their crucial moments we have visited with other pens; it remains for Mr. Ruhl to rifle larders we thought were bare. At Gallipoli, however, we are shown the Dardanelles from the Turkish heights for the first time:

> We could look down on the backs and heads of the Turkish soldiers; except for a wisp of smoke rising here and there from some hidden camp cook-stove, there was not a sign of life in the English trenches. Snipers were attending to that. . . . No, one didn't care to be hanging on to that strip of beach with those Australians and New Zealanders. From the south and west there was the continual *Br-r-um-m, br-r-um-m* of big guns, and over Kapa Tepe way we could see shells bursting. We sat there for an hour or so, waiting for one of the little specks on the blue sea floor to fire or sink.

This chapter on the Turkish defence at Gallipoli gives an adequate insight into the miracles that German efficiency wrought with the splendid fighting material that is the Turkish peasant, as well as showing the futility that must have been patent to the Allied generals in their vain but gallant efforts to make something out of the colossal blunder.

Drama

THE STAGE IN LONDON—BARRIE'S NEW PHANTASY AND OTHER RECENT PRODUCTIONS.

By WILLIAM ARCHER.

LONDON, April 12.

Sir James Barrie is very cannily, and indeed very wisely, practicing war economy. He is saving up his genius until people are once more in a fit frame of mind for artistic appreciation. Meanwhile, like other patriots, he is going through his wardrobe and seeing what old suits can be cleaned and pressed and done up for temporary wear. Nay, more—he has made a raid upon the enemy and annexed an idea from Gerhart Hauptmann, wherewith to furnish forth the second act of his new phantasy, "A Kiss for Cinderella." And he has made, withal, a very pleasant entertainment, full of those ingenious whimsies which germinate inexhaustibly in Barrie's brain, and nowhere else. He agreeably diverts the public mind for two and a half hours; and, frankly, that is what we want in war-time. But his phantasy is not a thing that will be remembered, and much less revived, "When the hurly-burly's done, When the battle's lost and won."

His heroine is a little drudge, maid-of-all-work in a set of studios, whose quaint imagination has earned for her the nickname of Cinderella. She has dwelt so long upon the story that she actually believes herself to be Cinderella, and more than half expects a royal footman to appear one day with an "invite" to a ball at which she will conquer the heart of Prince Hard-to-Please. So far the character is very like the heroine of a clever little play named "'Op o' Me Thumb," by Frederick Fenn and Richard Pryce—which is the less surprising, as "'Op o' Me Thumb" is an extremely Barrie-ish piece of work.

In the leisure of her evenings Cinderella acts as consulting physician, dressmaker, and general adviser to the poor people of her slum, charging a penny for each consultation; and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she keeps a sort of crèche for stray babies, who lie in boxes attached to the walls of her room, and (as in "Little Mary") all pop up their heads together at a given cue. Her evening occupations ended, Cinderella goes out into the snowy street to look for the royal footman, sinks down in the snow from sheer exhaustion, and, like Hauptmann's Hannele, realizes in a fever-dream all the ambitions and vanities of her childish heart. Cinderella does not go to heaven, indeed, but she goes to the royal ball; and, just as Hannele's beloved schoolmaster is the hero of her dream, and ultimately merges into the figure of Christ, so the Prince of Cinderella's vision wears the features of a sturdy policeman whom she secretly adores.

The scene of the dream-ball is pretty and entertaining. While the resemblance to "Hannele" is so strong that there is no overlooking it, I am sure Sir James Barrie would be the first to admit that his purely humorous episode enters into no sort of competition with Hauptmann's profound and poetic piece of child-psychology. There is no common measure for the two performances. In the last act we find Cinderella recovering from an attack of pneumonia, playing the good fairy in a hospital for wounded soldiers, and receiving a visit from her policeman-prince, who brings with him, in place of an engagement ring, a pair of slippers not at all unlike the glass slipper of her dream. Miss Hilda Trevelyan is, of course, the Cinderella, and Mr. Gerald du Maurier the Policeman.

I find it no easy matter to account to myself for the rather active distaste with which I witnessed, at the Court Theatre, a play named "Kultur at Home," by Rudolf Besier and Sybil Spottiswoode. I cannot allege any logical reason why we should not comment unfavorably on the manners of an enemy nation. We are doing so every day in print, in terms far severer than any employed by the authors of this comedy, who are not libelling at large, but writing with some knowledge of their subject. Why should the dramatist be denied the freedom of the journalist? I can give no good reason, but merely record an unconquerable feeling that the thing had much better have been left undone. The first-night public did not share that feeling, and I understand the piece is a success. But somehow I left the theatre a little humiliated, with the sense of having assisted at an undignified proceeding.

Perhaps part of my uneasiness arose from the rather glaring artistic weakness of the play. In the first act we find an English girl, Margaret Tinworth, living in the house of a Major Kolbeck, in a small garrison town in Germany, and utterly infatuated with everything German. Among other things, she is infatuated with her host's nephew, Lieut. Kurt Hartling, though any one can see at a glance that he is a handsome numskull and bounder. In the next act she has married her Kurt, and the honeymoon is scarcely over before she sees that she has made a ghastly mistake. That she should have been disillusioned as to her lord and master is, of course, probable enough; but why should she show neither comprehension nor the most ordinary tactful tolerance for the aspects of German life for which she "schwärmed" only a few weeks before? She then declared herself enchanted with Major Kolbeck's frowsy, stuffy house; but now, in her own house, she insists on outraging the prejudices of her husband and his circle in order to furnish her drawing-room according to the æsthetic precepts of Tottenham Court Road. In her behavior, too, she pays no attention to German etiquette, but insists on acting just as if she were in England. She is peremptorily and very rudely called to order by the wife of her husband's colonel; and her husband, instead of taking her part, treats her with a near approach to physical brutality. Thereupon she leaves him and goes off with some English relatives to Luxembourg. In a few days the war breaks out, and Margaret is so abashed by the belief that England is not going to stand in that she very nearly returns to Kurt, who still loves her in his disagreeable way. But the news opportunely arrives that England has declared war; whereupon Margaret does likewise and sends him about his horrible business.

Her extreme foolishness takes off the edge of the authors' satire; yet they evidently intend us to feel, not only that everything German is wrong, but that everything English is right. Perhaps it is the shallowness of this appeal to the passions of the moment that offends me. Perhaps, in the last analysis, I feel that the animosity which has arisen between Germany and England is too horrible, too tragic, too utterly deplorable, to be made the subject of an evening's entertainment. Which must not be taken as meaning that I dissent from the views of my countrymen as to the spirit by which Germany is possessed.

Every one who knows Mr. H. B. Irving knows that he is a great amateur of judicial drama. He has written a book about French murder-cases, and a very good book, too. In another book, nominally devoted to theatrical subjects, he tells the story of that most incredible of all crimes, the murder of Fualdès. This predilection is plainly traceable in his choice of plays—he loves something with a dash of the Sherlock Holmes in it. No sooner has "The Case of Lady Camber" run its course than he follows it with "The Barton Mystery," by Mr. Walter Hackett. Mr. Hackett is an author who has a passion for playing tricks with his audience. He first became known on this side through a play called (I think) "Nine to Eleven," conceived on the same plan as "Seven Keys to Baldpate," but a great deal less amusing. Now, in "The Barton Mystery," he goes one better and subjects his audience to a double mystification. A murder has been committed. A young man is tried for it and found guilty; but of course we know quite well that he is screening somebody. Mr. Hackett does everything to make us believe that that somebody is a certain Mrs. Standish, a sister of the girl to whom he is engaged. Among others, her husband, Richard Standish, M.P., adopts this belief; and, to our unspeakable amazement, he falls to reproaching her as Othello reproaches Desdemona, and then, to complete the analogy, strangles her. Just as he has thrown her body down behind a sofa, the lady walks in at the drawing-room door in perfect preservation—and we realize that the murder episode has only been a bad dream begotten of jealousy.

In the end it appears that it was not Mrs. Standish, but her sister, whom the accused man was screening; indeed, it was the sister who actually committed the murder. Here again the author succeeds in taking us by surprise; but it is by perfectly illegitimate means. There is no art in deceiving an audience by making people speak and act in a way wholly inconsistent with their true situation. Mr. Irving's part is that of a professor of "psychometry"—alias a clairvoyant—who contributes to the unravelling of the mystery. He is a grotesque charlatan of a very old-fashioned type; but the author leaves us quite in the dark as to whether he is a humbug through and through, or does really possess supernormal gifts. It seems probable, on the whole, that we are intended to adopt the former theory; but in that case his powers of deception are miraculous—far more miraculous than clairvoyance. Until Mr. Hackett condescends to write a "straight" play, we must hold in suspense our judgment of his talent.

Mr. Arthur Bourchier has produced at His Majesty's a romantic drama named "Stand and Deliver," by Mr. Justin Huntly McCarthy. Strange are the ways of managers! Only a few months ago, at the same theatre, a very much better play of the same type, Mr. Louis Parker's "Mavourneen," had but a brief run, though it was helped out by the charming talent of Miss Lily Elsie. In "Stand and Deliver" there is no Lily Elsie, and the centre of attraction is a highwayman of such solid proportions as to fit him much better for a motor bandit, since no Black Bess ever foaled could carry him at a reasonable speed. Perhaps that is the reason why, as a matter of fact, he never says "Stand and deliver!" to anybody, but spends his time in impersonating a French nobleman and mixing with the wits and beauties of the Restoration. Mr. Bourchier is an excellent actor in his own parts, but Claude Duval is not one of them.

The side-shows have recently given us two interesting pieces. The Stage Society produced "Youth," by Mr. Miles Malleson, a young actor of some talent. "Youth" might be the title of half the plays of the day, for the younger generation is vastly interested in itself, and seems rather to imagine that nobody was ever young before—an amiable illusion. Mr. Malleson is also much interested in the pleasant Bohemianism of the newer theatrical life—the life of the repertory theatres. This affords an amusing background to the main action—if action it can be called—which is concerned with a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

young man's difficulties and dubieties as to love and marriage. Both in title and theme the little play awakens vague reminiscences of two German pieces—Halbe's "Jugend" and Wedekind's "Frühlings-Erwachen." It has nothing like the power of either of these works; but while it is outspoken to a degree that would have been thought impossible ten years ago, it is incomparably more sane and wholesome than the German tragedies of youth.

The second side-show play was "Ellen Young," by Edmund Goulding and Gabrielle Enthoven—a lady who is reputed to possess the finest collection of playbills in England. The heroine of this well-written and interesting piece is a girl of humble birth and morbid temperament who believes that she has only a year to live. Her passionate revolt against this destiny inspires her with a strange power of frenzied and fantastic dancing, which obtains for her a great success at the music-halls. The act in which we see her surrounded by admirers while she is shuddering under the shadow of death is original and effective, and offers a fine opportunity for the tragic talent of Miss Hilda Moore, an actress who has of late been rising into note. Then a skilful doctor pronounces that her life may be saved, and she goes abroad for a year. Returning in radiant health, she thinks she is going to resume her triumphs at the halls. But behold! her talent has departed with her morbid moods, and she finds herself reduced to the sad anti-climax of marrying a devoted lover. The last act, unfortunately, is all too clearly foreseen, and is rather perfunctory in its psychology. I wonder whether the authors ever read George Eliot's "Armgart"?

Mr. Louis Parker's "Disraeli" has at last found its way to the English stage. It was produced last week at the Royalty Theatre, with great success. Mr. Dennis Eadie, who plays the title-part, is not so clearly "born to play it" as Mr. Arliss was; but he composes the personality with extraordinary skill. I need scarcely say that the play has slightly altered its complexion since its first production in 1911. Then Russia was the villain of the piece; but now Russia has quite dropped out, and we find that in buying the Suez Canal shares Disraeli was foiling the Machiavellian schemes of Prussia. He speaks of that Power in terms which, if we could believe that he ever used them, would entitle him to rank among the Major Prophets.

"A WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE."

The revival at the Fulton Theatre of Oscar Wilde's "A Woman of No Importance" brings into contrast the old smartness and the new. The latter, as represented by Mr. Shaw and his followers, has taken the wrongs of society with apparent seriousness, and, no doubt spurred on by an age of excessive social changes, has been willing to see society itself turned upside down. The former, of which many lines in this play are typical, accepting the social order as a quite necessary arrangement, was content to be merely cynical at its expense. One sort is ready to make puppets of its characters that an idea may live; at the hands of the older sort the characters were fairly secure, and the satirical idea never attained more than a gadfly's vitality. A set of conditions which furnished Wilde with an entertaining and at times rather moving play would be enough to-day to serve as dramatic propaganda. Here is a decided shifting of emphasis, and as life itself is largely a question of emphasis the contrast in the two kinds of smartness is significant.

"A Woman of No Importance" gives a glimpse into ultra-fashionable English life and, by means of the liaison of a titled roué with a girl of the substantial middle class, reveals its vapidity. The plot, though handled easily, is not entirely free from melodrama. That does not matter; the central situation of man who has seduced a decent girl and then refused to marry her brings two social strata into contact and of itself provides the author with ample opportunity for his stinging shots at those whose first duty is not even to be respectable.

Holbrook Blinn in the principal part read his lines excellently and gave the finished performance that one has come to expect of him, though his frank, open face seemed not altogether in keeping with the character impersonated. As "The Woman" Miss Margaret Anglin acted with admirable repose, and was entirely satisfying except possibly for a moment at the climax of the big scene when she apprises her son of his parentage. Commendation is also owing to George Le Guere for his performance in the part of the son. F.

Music

IN THE WORLD'S MUSICAL METROPOLIS.

The war has worked such havoc among members of European orchestras that it would doubtless be impossible now to find one in Germany, Austria, Italy, France, Russia, or England equal in its personnel to the New York Philharmonic, Symphony, or Metropolitan, or the Boston and Chicago Symphony Orchestras; perhaps none equal even to the Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis organizations. Thus America, by the strange and tragic course of events, has become the world's centre of orchestral music, with New York as the headquarters. During the season which officially ended with the month of April, all the orchestras just mentioned, except those belonging to Cincinnati and Chicago, have been heard here, besides several others. The total number of orchestral concerts given here in seven months amounts to at least 125, of which number the Philharmonic contributed 46, the Symphony Society 27, and the Boston Orchestra 10—these figures being for Manhattan Borough alone. That the public is permitted to enjoy so many high-class entertainments is due to the munificence of three millionaires—Higginson, Pulitzer, Flagler—and others who help to cover the inevitable deficits. It would surprise the public to know how large these deficits are, notwithstanding the fact that the attendance during the last season was in all cases bigger than ever in the past. The concerts have maintained their usual high level, and if no great novelties have been produced, that is probably not the fault of the conductors. It has been argued that novelties by American composers should be placed more frequently on orchestral programmes, but it must be borne in mind that orchestras living largely on bequests cannot afford to do much experimenting. A programme made up of popular favorites is worth at least a thousand dollars more than one containing the names of unfamiliar compositions.

Experience has shown that, as a rule, a large audience can be drawn to an orchestral concert only by an exceptionally attractive programme or a popular soloist, and in the latter case the piece he plays makes a difference. When Fritz Kreisler, for instance, played the Beethoven and Tchaikovsky concertos with the Philharmonic, the sign "All Seats Sold" had to be put up; but when he played the Brahms concerto—though it is known that he does it incomparably well—there were six rows of unsold seats in Carnegie Hall. In the same hall, not long afterwards, Kreisler, all alone, drew a $9,000 audience with a programme of such pieces as he has made dear to the public. It was a charity recital. Many of Paderewski's recitals have been in aid of Poland. Fired by patriotic ardor, his playing has been more enthralling than ever before. Ossip Gabrilowitsch has reason to be proud of the success he won with his series of historic piano recitals. Concert-goers do not usually favor schemes that suggest an educational intention, but this eminent Russian's programmes, while arranged in chronological order, included so many popular masterpieces that the demand for seats exceeded the supply.

So many first-class artists have been driven to these shores by the European war that the minor ones have found the going harder than ever before. If most of these should decide that music doesn't pay, it would be a blessing for them and everybody else. If they fail to attract attention, it is nearly always their own fault. Merit will out. Last year Percy Grainger was unknown in this country. To-day he can take only a fraction of all the engagements offered him, while his original and fascinating compositions magnetize a multitude of programmes throughout this country and Canada.

The old adage that there is always room on top has also been illustrated this season by a young girl of twenty, Guiomar Novaes, who was sent to Paris a few years ago by the Brazilian Government to continue her studies. Her first recital in Aeolian Hall, last autumn, revealed her as a pianist of the first rank, and two further recitals elicited a crescendo of applause and critical praise. She will be one of the favorites next season, which in all probability will be an even busier one than the present,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unless the minor aspirants realize that it is not worth while to appear in the world's musical metropolis. Let them bear in mind the overproduction, the difficulty of pleasing audiences, and critics who daily hear the greatest of the world's artists in the opera house and concert halls; bear in mind that, as an industrious journalist has computed, 127 singers, 67 pianists, and 39 violinists have, with others, appeared in Manhattan Borough this season. Is it not sheer madness to hope to make an impression under such conditions? It is, unless you happen to be a Percy Grainger or a Guiomar Novaes.

The season's operatic events were discussed in this place a few weeks ago. Reference was made to one of its most interesting features, the first production at the Metropolitan of a Spanish opera, the "Goyescas" of Enrique Granados. It was a success, despite an unsatisfactory interpretation which greatly distressed the composer. He invited me to his box for the last performance, with Paderewski and Schelling, hoping that it would prove better than the others; but it was the worst of them all, and it was pitiable to see the looks of displeasure in his face over the conductor's incorrect tempi, and the nervous movements of his hands indicating how they should have been taken. It was the first time he had had an opportunity to present one of his operas outside of Spain, and to provide for his family. He was looking forward to triumphs in South America next season. But he was a victim of the Sussex crime. He and his charming wife were drowned, leaving a family of six children, the oldest of them only sixteen, unprovided for. For their benefit Mr. Otto H. Kahn arranged a concert at the Metropolitan Opera House last Sunday evening, which yielded $11,000. It was given by an array of artists absolutely unprecedented: Maria Barrientos, the greatest of living colorature singers, and Paderewski, Kreisler, and Casals, the greatest of living pianists, violinists, and violoncellists, besides John McCormack, the most popular and prosperous of all tenors, *not* excepting Caruso, and the popular Dutch lieder singer, Julia Culp. To hear Paderewski, Kreisler, and Casals play together Beethoven's trio in D major was an opportunity that occurs but once in a lifetime.

HENRY T. FINCK.

Art

A GENTLEMAN'S VASARI.

Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects. By Giorgio Vasari. Newly translated by Gaston Du C. De Vere, with 500 illustrations. In ten volumes. Post 8vo. New York: The Macmillan Co. $70 net.

When Giorgio Vasari, in 1550, published his first edition of the "Lives," his object was to make a book for the gentleman and amateur. It was printed on the best Florentine press of the day—that of Torrentino; it was a book rather to be read and enjoyed than to be studied. In the second edition of 1566, Vasari had recourse to famous though less fastidious printers, the brothers Giunta, and now he adorned the work with many wood blocks, each in an ornamental baroque frame, cut from his own designs. For two hundred years occasional reprints maintained this tradition of a gentleman's book. A three-volume reimpression at Bologna, about the middle of the seventeenth century, was virtually, with the difference of Roman type for the original italic, a facsimile of the Giunta edition. A Roman edition of about a century later kept the traditional format.

Then the nineteenth century and connoisseurship dawned together. Vasari ceased to be a gentleman's and became a scholar's book. Already the little Milanese edition of the early years of the century carried its obscuring trail of corrections and footnotes. The famous Lemonnier edition, Florence, of the 30's, swamped the text with apparatus. In the late 70's Gaetano Milanesi produced with appalling thoroughness what is still the standard edition. And only five years ago we had the first volume of a truly gigantic edition by Prof. Karl Frey, of Berlin.

Unhappily, the English editions stem from the scientific period. The rather loose paraphrase by Mrs. Foster, in the Bohn Library, with Dr. Richter's notes, has many excellences as a scholar's book, but it is not such as an amateur would willingly place on his shelves or take to his heart. Messrs. Blashfield and Hopkins, in their "Selected Lives," tried for a compromise, but the annotation is still excessive for a gentle reader. Much better in this respect is the German edition of a few years ago. Reprints in the cheap standard series do not meet the requirements of the bibliophile.

In planning the stately ten-volume edition which lies before us, the Medici Society and the Macmillans in conjunction have returned to first principles. Three hundred and fifty years after the Giunta edition we have the first English Vasari which is really fit for a gentleman's shelves. Mr. De Vere found his warrant for a new translation in the filed-down character of Mrs. Foster's fluent paraphrase. She smoothed out the angularities and withal much of the picturesqueness of Vasari for the student's greater ease. But these are precisely the qualities that a gentle reader wants. Mr. De Vere has been at pains, and generally with success, to keep the slow, amiable involutions of the original text. It reads a bit archaistically, like a Tudor translation born out of due time, but the old-fashioned touch carries one back to Florence of the Academicians.

The volumes are in largest octavo, with their chief adornment the beautiful paper and invitingly open presswork. The cases are substantial blue buckram, good enough for long use, and not too good to be discarded for the permanent binding which the books deserve and will, doubtless, in most cases have. The old portraits are omitted, probably for reasons of decorative propriety. They would accord ill with a modern letterpress. Yet by omitting the ugly frames and reducing the portrait ovals in scale, vignettes rather valuable for record and decoratively available might have been contrived.

There is, save the indexes, no apparatus of any sort. One may sail by Vasari's most picturesquely wide misstatements without the discomfort of a danger-signal. The long preface on technique, being accessible in Prof. Baldwin Brown's admirable edition, is omitted. Otherwise the text is given complete, down to the smallest Academician. All this is as it should be. One should read Vasari in an irresponsible and cheerful spirit, and some time or other one should read all of him. He was one of those inspired asses who, after all, appreciate the wit and wisdom of others, sop it up like a sponge. You cannot squeeze him without getting juice.

Where a fine connoisseurship does come into this volume is in the illustrations. They are admirably selected, without neglect either of the inevitable great examples or of remote exquisite works in private or provincial galleries. Of the 500 collotype plates some 75 are in colors. These are unequally successful, but they average well, are often evocative, and always more delicately executed than the current larger plates of German manufacture. For one who knows his galleries, a re-reading of Vasari in the light of these illustrations would be the equivalent of an æsthetic *grand tour* under the most delightful personal conduct. In such an edition Vasari comes once more to his own, and addresses with far greater effectiveness than was possible in his own time those gentle folk for whose delight the "Lives" were conceived and executed.

Finance

THE STOCK EXCHANGE AND THE GERMAN REPLY.

Like the rest of the community, the Stock Exchange on Friday of last week displayed a succession of changing judgments, as it read the note from the Berlin Foreign Office. Part of the message was at hand when the market opened; that part contained the proposal to continue investigating the Sussex incident; also a repudiation of the charge of indiscriminate torpedoing; also the assertion that the German submarines had already been ordered not to sink without warning (unless it was the enemy's merchant ship), and had obeyed the orders, except when they made mistakes. These astonishing passages caused the same amazement and indignation on Wall Street as elsewhere in the news-reading community.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prices of stocks broke as much as 4 or 5 points, on the inference that no respectful consideration could be given to such a note.

In the course of half an hour came the section of the message with a hint of concession first; an assertion of Germany's own attachment to the sacred principles of humanity next; a charge that it is England which has made war on the lives and property of non-combatants; a complaint at us for not quarrelling with England rather than with Germany, and then the promise that the humane international law of visit and search would hereafter be observed by German submarines, even in the "war zone." After reading this, the stock market recovered all its early loss, and began to show signs of rising further.

People outside of Wall Street paid even more attention to the text that followed, conditioning this observance of international law by Germany, not only on our Government's effort to make England stop blockading the German coast, but on our success in that friendly effort. But the mixture of resentment and amusement at so extraordinary a peroration, however it affected the community outside, had no effect on the Stock Exchange. The market closed that day with rising prices, and the advance was continued on the ensuing days.

Whatever the immediate outcome of this extraordinary communication from Berlin, the future course of the Stock Exchange is likely now to prove exactly how far the German dispute has been an overruling influence. In a situation such as has existed during the past four months, the inference as to the really essential financial influence is never wholly clear. A part of Wall Street has believed all along that the "German crisis" was an incident, the main cause of the market's hesitation being doubt over future economic conditions. Another, and probably the larger, part has contended that, but for the overhanging uncertainty as to relations with Berlin, trade would continue to expand with even greater vigor, and the advance on the Stock Exchange be resumed.

After overnight reflection on the extraordinary German message, financial judgment seemed to have based itself on one main consideration. Whatever else was indicated by the ill-mannered note from the Berlin Foreign Office, it shows the anxiety of the German Government to avoid a break. Such an attitude may readily be taken for granted. Our army and navy could not probably help or hinder in the war; but in three particulars, well understood in both political and financial Berlin, an outright rupture with the United States would be a calamity to Germany. It would serve as a possible signal to every other strong and self-respecting neutral Power whose merchant ships the lawless submarine commanders have been destroying. It would probably turn the financial resources of this country much more directly to the aid of the Allies. It would certainly mean that, after the war, the claims of financial and commercial Germany on the resources of this country, which will then hold the key to the world's economic situation, would be gravely prejudiced.

One inference from these well-known facts, and from the very plain reflection of them in the German note, is that Berlin would probably give way at once to a firm and contemptuous reiteration, by our Government, of its previous refusal to become, as a price of averting murder of our citizens, the agent of Germany to make England less severe with her. Another inference is equally important. Even supposing that the Berlin Foreign Office, with the Admiralty's fingers on its throat, will not remove its impossible conditions, the evident attitude of the German Government gives strong assurance that, with or without a formal diplomatic breach, there will be no declaration of war. It is that possibility, rather than any recall of Ambassadors, which has spread misgiving over the Stock Exchange.

For the present, the financial markets seemed last week to have waved aside the question what the German Admiralty itself would do. Nobody fully understands that situation. No one has even attempted to explain the removal of von Tirpitz, followed by even more outrageous violations of law, decency, and humanity than before. But the very fact that this aspect of the matter is a mystery leads to the relegation of its possibilities to the future.

It is undeniable that a very considerable body of experienced financial opinion holds that the civil government at Berlin either cannot or will not keep faith indefinitely in this matter, and that a breach of relations will remain a possibility, even with this immediate dispute patched up. But there are few experienced financiers who look for actual war as the longer outcome. The Stock Exchange bases its judgment on the fact that war occurs only when one or both of two parties to an international dispute desire it. That the United States does not want war has been made abundantly evident. That Germany is most anxious to avoid it, the language of the note of May 5 emphatically proved.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Holme, C. The Home Coming. McBride. $1.40 net.
Hopkins, N. M. The Strange Case of Mason Brant. Lippincott. $1.25 net.
Irwin, F. The Road to Mecca. Putnam. $1.35 net.
Lutz, G. L. The Finding of Jasper Holt. Lippincott. $1.25 net.
Warner, A. Susan Clegg and Her Love Affairs. Boston: Little, Brown. $1.30 net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Baker, J. H. American University Progress. Longmans, Green. $1 net.
Bisland, E. The Case of John Smith, His Heaven and Hell. Putnam. $1.25 net.
Cummings, L. M. Professor Huskins. Boston: Badger. $1.50 net.
Dearborn, G. Van N. The Influence of Joy. Little, Brown. $1 net.
Freeman, F. N. The Psychology of the Common Branches. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Kretzmann, P. E. Education Among the Jews. Boston: Badger. $1 net.
La Vie Héroïque Series: La Femme Française. Espouses et Mères. Nos Jeunes Filles. Paris, France: Bloud et Gay.
Macy, C. L. The Brief with Selection for Briefing. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Milton, J. Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
Quiller-Couch, A. On the Art of Writing. Putnam. $1.50 net.
Quirk, L. W. Ice-Boat Number One. Little, Brown. $1.20 net.
Shepard, O. Shakespeare Questions. An Outline for the Study of Leading Plays. Houghton Mifflin. 50 cents net.
Stopes, Mrs. C. C. Shakespeare's Industry. Macmillan. $3.25 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Hurgronje, C. S. Mohammedanism. Putnam. $1.50 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Bidwell, P. W. Rural Economy in New England at the Beginning of the 19th Century. New Haven, Conn.: Conn. Academy of Arts and Sciences.
Dahlinger, C. W. Pittsburgh: A Sketch of Its Early Social Life. Putnam. $1.25 net.
Nystrom, P. H. Economics of Retailing. Ronald Press. $2.
Pratt, E. A. The Rise of Rail Power in War and Conquest. 1833-1914. Lippincott. $2.50 net.
Taft, W. H. Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers. Columbia Univ. Press. $1.50 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Baillaud, and Others. Civilisation Française 1870-1915. Paris, France: Hachette et Cie.
Colombel, E. Journal d'une Infirmière d'Arras. Paris, France: Bloud et Gay.
Francke, K. The German Spirit. Holt. $1 net.
Lechartier, G. La Charité et la Guerre. Paris, France: Bloud et Gay.

FINANCIAL DIRECTORY

6%
FIRST MORTGAGES
6%

I own and offer for sale, at par and accrued interest, a lot of choice first mortgages, each
Secured by improved real estate in Kansas City, Mo., worth at least twice the amount of loan.
Ultra conservative valuations by our own expert appraisers.
Principal notes accompanying mortgages identified as original by County Recorder of Deeds.
Title Guarantee policy, with seal of genuineness, issued by Kansas City Title & Trust Co., accompanies each mortgage.
Loans mature in three to five years. Interest payable semi-annually.

Correspondence invited.

ARTHUR FELS
Mortgage Banker
N. Y. Life Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Masson, F. Les Femmes et la Guerre de 1914. Paris, France: Bloud et Gay.
Olcott, C. S. The Life of William McKinley. 2 vols. Houghton Mifflin. $5 net set.
Ombiaux, M. La Reine Elisabeth. Paris, France: Bloud et Gay.
Wood, L. Our Military History. Reilly & Britton. $1 net.

POETRY.

British Verse for Boys. Selected and Edited by D. V. Thompson. Holt.
Carman, B. April Airs. Boston: Small Maynard.
Dresback, G. W. The Road to Everywhere. Boston: Badger. $1 net.
Keeler, C. Victory. New York. L. J. Gomme. $1.
Margetson, G. R. The Fledgling Bard and the Poetry Society. Boston: Badger.
Mukerji, D. G. Rajani. San Francisco: Paul Elder. $1 net.
Sanburg, C. Chicago Poems. Holt. $1.25 net.
Schaffer, A. Selected Poems. Boston: Badger. 75 cents net.
Sherrick, M. M. Wintergreen. Boston: Badger. $1 net.

SCIENCE.

Hoffman, F. L. The Mortality from Cancer Throughout the World. Newark, N. J.: The Prudential Press.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

Burleigh, L., and Bierstadt, E. H. Punishment. Holt. $1 net.
Hofmannsthal, H. von. Madonna Dianora. Boston: Badger. 75 cents net.

ART.

Low Cost Suburban Homes. Edited by R. Wright. McBride. $1.25 net.

New Volumes in

THE HOME UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

New books by authorities. Each 50c. 101 volumes ready. Send for descriptive list.

POLAND
By W. Alison Phillips, University of Dublin. The History of Poland, with special emphasis upon the Polish question of the present day.

POLITICAL THOUGHT: The Utilitarians. From Bentham to J. S. Mill.
By William L. P. Davidson

DANTE.
By Jefferson B. Fletcher, Columbia University. An interpretation of Dante and his teaching from his writings.

Some Earlier Volumes

By John Masefield
SHAKESPEARE

By Gilbert Murray
EURIPIDES AND HIS AGE

By W. E. B. DuBois
THE NEGRO

By R. C. K. Ensor
BELGIUM

By Maurice Baring
RUSSIAN LITERATURE

By Bertrand Russell
PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY

By W. R. Sheperd
LATIN AMERICA

By H. A. L. Fisher
NAPOLEON

By Warde Fowler
ROME

By G. K. Chesterton
VICTORIAN LITERATURE

Henry Holt & Co. 34 W. 33d St. New York

The Case of John Smith

His Heaven and His Hell

Elizabeth Bisland

Author of "Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn," "At the Sign of the Hobby Horse," etc.

12°. $1.25.

John Smith, a humble toiler, shows himself receptive to the truths that the Spirit of Understanding is able to unveil. And so before him is unfolded the course of Cosmic history. He beholds the wonders of the infinitely great and the infinitely minute, the growth and decay of worlds, the development of life, the formation of creeds, the error and evil and false ideals with which the world has battled.

Mohammedanism

(American Lectures on the History of Religions Series)

C. Snouck Hurgronje

Author of "The Holy War Made in Germany."

8°. $1.50 net.

A concise account of the main problems connected with the origin, the religious and political growth, and the present state of Mohammedanism—especially timely in view of the fact that the fate of Mohammedanism—the extension or curtailment of its political influence—is so closely involved with the outcome of the war.

All Booksellers

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

NEW YORK **LONDON**

Read

L. M. Montgomery's new "ANNE" book

ANNE OF THE ISLAND

A SEQUEL TO

"ANNE OF GREEN GABLES" *310th thousand*
"ANNE OF AVONLEA" *109th thousand*

This week's issue of THE NATION comprises 13,057 copies: of this 8,708 go to paid subscribers and 900 go to exchanges or are sent out as free copies. The average weekly newsstand sale during the year 1915 was 1,145. Average for 4 months ending April 30, 971 copies.

In view of the large library and college and family circulation of THE NATION, it is safe to assume that not less than 40,000 people read it each week.

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

Vol. 68. THE ORIGINS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE

Being a Translation from the Arabic. Accompanied with Annotations. Geographic and Historic Notes of the Kitâb Futûh Al-Buldân of al-Imâm abu-l 'Abbâs Ahmad ibn-Jâbir al-Balâdhuri.

By PHILIP KHÛRI HITTI, Ph.D., On the Permanent Staff of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirût, Syria; Gustav Gottheil Lecturer in Columbia University. 8vo. Pp. xii+518. *Paper Covers*, $4.00,* *Cloth*, $4.50.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

The Nation At Leading Book Stores

THE NATION is on sale at leading book stores and newsstands throughout the United States and Canada. Our readers will confer a favor by reporting to us any newsstand or book store at which they are unable to obtain copies of THE NATION. If you desire to secure a copy regularly through the newsdealer, during temporary sojourn at any place, it is a good plan to give him a regular order. List of dealers in a number of cities where THE NATION may be obtained is as follows:

Ann Arbor, Mich., H. Stofflet.
Atlanta, Ga., Miller's Book Store.
Baltimore, Md., Newsstand, Hotel Belvedere.
Beloit, Wis., E. A. Nelson.
Boston, Mass., Old Corner Book Store.
Boulder, Col., Greenman Stores, 1219 Pearl Street.
Buffalo, N. Y., Iroquois Hotel Newsstand.
Chicago, Ill., A. C. McClurg & Co.
Chicago, Ill., A. Kroch.
Chicago, Ill., John V. Sheehan & Co., 260 Woodward Ave.
Cleveland, O., Pushaw Stand in Superior Arcade.
Decatur, Ill., W. T. McFadden.
Denver, Col., The Kendrick-Bellamy Co., 801 Sixteenth.
Galesburg, Ill., G. A. Swenson.
Hartford, Conn., H. P. Koppleman.
Milwaukee, Wis., T. S. Gray Co.,104 Wisconsin St.
Ithaca, N. Y., D. Mayers.
Madison, Wis., The College Book Store.
Minneapolis, Century Newsstand, 10 S. 3rd.
Montreal, Chapman's Book Store, 190 Peel Street.
New Orleans, La., C. E. Staub.
New Orleans, La., G. E. Hill.
Newport, R. I., W. P. Clarke Co.
Philadelphia, Pa., C. B. Swift, Bullitt Bldg.; L. G. Rau, 7th and Chestnut Streets; Greene Hotel, 8th and Chestnut Streets.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Boggs & Buhl Book Dept.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Horne's Book Dept.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Jones Book Shop, 416 Wood St.
Portland, Ore., J. K. Gill Co., Third and Alder Sts.
Richmond, Va., Richmond News Co.
San Francisco, Cal., Golden Gate News Co.
Springfield, Mass., Hotel Kimball Newsstand.
St. Louis, Mo., Philip Roeder Book Store, 703 Locust St.
Toronto, Canada, Prince George Hotel Newsstand.
Toronto, Canada, McKenna's Book Store, 235 Yonge Street.
Troy, N. Y., Allen Bookstore 456 Fulton St.
Washington, D. C., Newsstands at Raleigh, Willard, and Shoreham Hotels; Adams News Depot, 622 9th Street.
Winnipeg, Canada, F. R. Morris, 235 Portage Ave.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED